

**Agenda Item 9**  
**Report PC20/21-37**

Report to	<b>Planning Committee</b>
Date	<b>11 March 2021</b>
By	<b>Director of Planning</b>
Title of Report	<b>Adoption of the West Sussex Soft Sand Single Issue Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To update Planning Committee on the progress of the Soft Sand Single Issue Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan and to request Planning Committee recommend the adoption of the Plan to the National Park Authority</b>

**Recommendation:**

**The Committee is asked to recommend the National Park Authority:**

- 1) Note the content of the Inspector's Report and his conclusion that the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning for soft sand within the West Sussex including that area which lies within the National Park, provided that a number of Main Modifications are made to it;**
- 2) Note the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan;**
- 3) Delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority to make any other inconsequential changes to the text required prior to publication of the updated West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan;**
- 4) Adopt the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan as amended by the Inspector's recommended Main Modifications to form revised policies M2 and M11 of the statutory minerals plan for the South Downs National Park within West Sussex, and use these policies as the basis for planning decisions for soft sand minerals development across this area of the National Park along with neighbourhood development plans and the South Downs Local Plan, where relevant; and**
- 5) Publish an updated version of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018) and the relevant Policies Map.**

**I. Introduction and Summary**

- I.1** The West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (JMLP) was prepared by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in partnership with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to cover the period to 2033.

- 1.2 The JMLP was adopted by the SDNPA and WSCC in July 2018. It provides a set of up to date planning policies on minerals in West Sussex both inside and outside the National Park, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.3 The adoption of the JMLP triggered the timetable to prepare a joint Single Issue Review of Soft Sand (SSR) as set out in the Inspector's Report and agreed by Planning Committee and NPA as part of the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) in March 2018.
- 1.4 The Authorities prepared documents and held consultation to the following timetable:

Winter 2019	Regulation 18 Issues and Options document
Winter 2020	Regulation 19 Draft Soft Sand Review document
April 2020	Submission of the SSR to the Planning Inspectorate
August 2020	Examination Hearings

- 1.5 Additional workshops and site visits were held with members, as well as meetings with stakeholders and mineral operators. Following the examination hearings, a consultation on the proposed Modifications was held from November 2020 to January 2021.
- 1.6 The Inspector has recommended adoption of the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan in his report of February 2021 (**Appendix 1**) subject to a number of modifications set out in **Appendix 2**. The SA and HRA statements relating to the modifications are provided in **Appendix 3 and 4** respectively. **Appendix 5** is a tracked change version of the SSR document showing the proposed modifications.
- 1.7 This report seeks that Planning Committee recommend adoption of the documents to the National Park Authority.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 During the examination hearings of the JMLP in September 2017, the Planning Inspector raised concerns about the soft sand strategy. The Inspector suggested modifications prior to adoption of the JMLP: to delete references to planning for a declining amount of sand extraction from within the National Park; to replace Policy M2 with new wording; and to remove the proposed Ham Farm allocation from Policy M11.
- 2.2 Accordingly, Policy M2 of the JMLP required the Authorities to undertake a Soft Sand Single Issue Review (SIR). This had to commence within six months of adoption of the JMLP and was required to be submitted to the Secretary of State within two years from the commencement of the review.

### Scope of the Review

- 2.3 The Authorities undertook the review between August 2018 and April 2020. The SSR considered the following three key issues:
- Issue 1: the identified need for soft sand during the period to 2033;
  - Issue 2: the supply strategy, namely, the options that can, either singularly or in combination, be used to meet any identified shortfall; and
  - Issue 3: the identification of potential sites and, if required, the selection of one or more of those sites to meet identified need.
- 2.4 The SIR did not consider any other mineral planning issues and did not seek to make changes to any other parts of the JMLP.

### Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.5 The Authorities undertook a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), as required by the European Union (EU) Strategic Environmental Assessment directive, to inform the preparation of this Review. The SA considers

the likely social, economic and environmental implications of the soft sand strategy options and the potential soft sand sites. The SA was updated at each stage of the Review including the consultation on the proposed modifications (**Appendix 3**). The Authorities will publish a post-adoption Strategic Environmental Assessment statement once the SSR is adopted by the SDNPA and WSCC.

#### Regulation 18

- 2.6 At this initial stage of the review, the Authorities set out the issues and options that relate to the demand for, and supply of, soft sand. We sought comments on these issues and options (and the supporting evidence) in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations (2012).

#### Regulation 19

- 2.7 The Regulation 19 consultation comprised revised draft policies M2 and M1 I and supporting documents to update the evidence base that had been prepared for the Joint Minerals Local Plan. Draft policy M2 proposed a sequential policy approach, which required proposals to consider the availability of soft sand outside of the South Downs National Park, including permitted sites or site allocations outside of the South Downs and West Sussex Plan Area.

#### Submission and Examination

- 2.8 Representations received in relation to the Regulation 19 consultation were forwarded to the Planning Inspector. The documents were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in April 2020 and the Hearings took place in August 2020. The examination library was made available on the website for the Joint Minerals Plan. Documents were available in line with the Statements of Community Involvement to the extent it was possible under the restrictions relating to the Covid 19 pandemic. The Examination took place virtually due to the pandemic and was only the second virtual local plan examination to be held in England.

#### Modifications Consultation and the Planning Inspector's report

- 2.9 A number of modifications were proposed to the document through the Examination. A period of representations was held from November 2020 to January 2021. Representations received were forwarded to the Planning Inspector and considered by him in the preparation of his report.
- 2.10 The Report was received in February 2021. The Planning Inspector recommends that the SSR can be adopted subject to a number of amendments. A full table of the proposed amendments is set out in **Appendix 2**.
- 2.11 There are a small number of changes to update references in the SSR with the latest data available in the Local Aggregates Assessment as well as some changes to correct typographical errors. The main modifications include:
- an amendment to proposed policy M2 to make it clear that the assessment of available resource in the wider south east relates to sites with planning permission or allocated in development plan documents
  - Amendments to the development principles for each site allocation in proposed policy M1 I include wording to:
    - improve protection for the water environment
    - strengthen the requirement for biodiversity net gain
    - refer to local wildlife sites and designations by name
    - strengthen references to cumulative impacts
- 2.12 Officers are not proposing any further changes to the Modifications set out by the Planning Inspector in **Appendix 2**. **Appendix 5** shows the final version of the text with all the proposed tracked changes to the Submission Draft SSR.

### The SSR: Revised policies M2 and M11 for the Joint Minerals Local Plan

The SSR proposed for adoption aims to meet a requirement for soft sand led by the continued preparation of the Local Aggregates Assessment. The strategy within revised Policy M2 requires applications to consider a hierarchy of locations for development, following the principle contained in the NPPF of looking outside of protected landscapes in the first instance.

- 2.13 In line with the above approach, the SSR propose three allocations to be added to policy M11 of the Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018). Ham Farm is a new quarry located outside of the SDNP. East of West Heath and Chantry Lane Extension are within the SDNP and any proposed application on these sites would be subject to further consideration in relation to major development.

### **3. Next Steps and Timetable**

- 3.1 If the full authorities of the SDNPA and WSCC approved the adoption of the SSR, officers will prepare updated text for the Joint Minerals Local Plan for publication on the JMLP website. Officers will also prepare the statutory post-adoption statements.
- 3.2 The updated JMLP will form the basis for decision making for all minerals development, including soft sand, within the West Sussex part of the South Downs National Park.
- 3.3 The policies of the JMLP will be monitored through the Minerals and Waste Authority Monitoring Report for West Sussex. A review of the JMLP is scheduled for 2023 in accordance with national regulations.

### **4. Other Implications**

<b>Implication</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority	Yes. The adoption of the SSR will require subsequent approval of the NPA.
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	The cost of preparing the JMLP is shared equally by both Authorities.
Has due regard been taken of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	Due regard, where relevant, has been taken of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equalities Act 2010. An Equality Impact Report (EIR) was prepared to support the JMLP, and the SSR, and was included in the supporting documentation for the Examination in Public.
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	The JMLP and SSR have been considered in light of statute and case law and any interference with an individual's human rights is considered to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised.
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	It is considered that the proposal does not raise any crime and disorder implications.
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	It is considered that the proposal does not raise any health and safety implications.
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy:	A Sustainability Appraisal (SA/SEA) was prepared to inform the preparation of the JMLP and at each stage of the SSR including the proposed modifications.

## 5. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
The adoption of the SSR is subject to the judicial review process. If the SSR is not adopted there will not be an appropriate policy basis for decision making on soft sand proposals within the West Sussex part of the South Downs National Park.	Low	High	The Authorities have undertaken the preparation of the SSR under the required legislation and regulations.

### TIM SLANEY

#### Director of Planning

#### South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: Kirsten Williamson, Planning Policy Lead

Tel: 01730 819277

Email: [kirsten.williamson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:kirsten.williamson@southdowns.gov.uk)

SDNPA Consultees Legal Services; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Director of Planning

External Consultees None

Background Documents Appendix 1: Inspector's report  
Appendix 2: Proposed Modifications  
Appendix 3: [Sustainability Appraisal Addendum](#)  
Appendix 4: [HRA Addendum](#)  
Appendix 5: SSR Proposed Amendments

For reference, the examination library is set out on the West Sussex County Council website:-  
[http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/mlp/mlp\\_doc\\_library.pdf](http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/mlp/mlp_doc_library.pdf)

This page is intentionally left blank



The Planning Inspectorate

---

# **Report to West Sussex County Council and South Downs National Park Authority**

**by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Date: 4 February 2021**

---

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(as amended)

Section 20

## **Report on the Examination of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan Single Issue Soft Sand Review**

The Plan was submitted for examination on 17 April 2020

Virtual Examination Hearings were held between 25 and 27 August 2020

File Ref: PINS/P3800/429/10

## Contents

Abbreviations	page 3
Summary	page 4
Introduction	page 5
Context of the Soft Sand Review	page 6
Public Sector Equality Duty	page 7
Assessment of Duty to Co-operate	page 7
Consideration of Public Consultation	page 9
Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance	page 10
Assessment of Soundness	
Issue 1 – Vision and Strategic Objectives	page 11
Issue 2 – Soft Sand Requirement	page 12
Issue 3 – Site Selection Process	page 14
Issue 4 – Policy M2: Soft Sand	page 18
Issue 5 – Policy M11: Strategic Minerals Site Allocations	
General – All Sites	page 19
Ham Farm, Steyning	page 20
East of West Heath Common Extension, Rogate	page 22
Chantry Lane Extension, Storrington	page 25
Conclusions on Policy 11 and Site Allocations	page 26
Overall Conclusion and Recommendation	page 27
Schedule of Recommended Main Modifications	Appendix



## Abbreviations

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DP	Development Principle
DtC	Duty to Co-operate
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
JMLP	Joint Minerals Local Plan
LAA	Local Aggregates Assessment
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MPA	Mineral Planning Authority
MM	Main Modification
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SDLP	South Downs Local Plan
SDNP	South Downs National Park
SDNPA	South Downs National Park Authority
SEEAWP	South East England Aggregates Working Party
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SSR	Soft Sand Review
the Authorities	WSCC and SDNPA
WSCC	West Sussex County Council

## Summary

This report concludes that the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (JMLP) Single Issue Soft Sand Review (SSR) provides an appropriate basis for planning the extraction of soft sand from reserves within West Sussex, including that part of the South Downs National Park within the County, provided that a number of Main Modifications (MMs) are made to its proposals. West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority, as joint Mineral Planning Authorities (the Authorities) have specifically requested that I recommend any MMs necessary to enable the policies and site allocations of the SSR to be adopted.

Following the Virtual Hearings, the Authorities prepared a Schedule of Proposed MMs and completed Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the changes. The MMs and the SA and HRA were subject to public consultation over an eight week period. In some cases I have amended the detailed wording of the MMs where necessary. I have recommended the implementation of the MMs after considering all the representations made in response to the consultation.

The Main Modifications are summarised as follows:

- Updated figures and text to Section 6.2 of the JMLP with respect to the existing supply of soft sand, based upon the most recent Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) to make also express reference to planning for a steady and adequate supply, including from allocated or permitted sites outside of West Sussex (MMs1-3);
- Amendments to the development principles for the three allocated soft sand sites, including to require hydrological survey results to be taken into account and to avoid and minimise impact on Local Wildlife Sites (MM4, MM5, MM6, MM7);
- Amendments to the development principles for the three allocated soft sand sites to require identification and incorporation of opportunities for net gains in biodiversity, in accordance with national policy (MM5, MM6, MM7).

## Introduction

1. This Report contains my assessment of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (JMLP) Single Issue Soft Sand Review (SSR) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the preparation of the SSR has complied with the Duty to Co-operate (DtC). It then considers whether the SSR is sound and whether it is compliant with all legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) (paragraph 35) makes clear that, in order to be sound, the SSR should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the Examination is the assumption that West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), as joint Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs - the Authorities), have submitted what they consider to be a sound review.
3. The West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan Soft Sand Review, submitted in April 2020, formed the basis for the Examination. It is the same document as was published for consultation in January to March 2020.
4. The Hearings were conducted in accordance with established procedure as virtual events via Zoom, live-streamed to the public, due to the Covid19 pandemic restrictions on public meetings.

## Main Modifications

5. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act, the Authorities requested that I recommend any Main Modifications (MMs) necessary to rectify matters that make the proposals of the SSR for changes to the JMLP unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. My Report explains why the recommended MMs, all of which relate to matters that were considered during the Examination, are necessary.
6. The MMs only relate to the proposals to modify the JMLP put forward by the SSR, referenced SSR1-43 and set out in Section 4 of the SSR document. The SSR document as a whole is not for adoption as a separate development plan document. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report (**MM1-7**) and are set out in full in the **Appendix** to this Report.
7. Following the Examination Hearings, the Authorities prepared a Schedule of Proposed MMs. This was subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and public consultation for a period of eight weeks in December-January 2020-21. I have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to my conclusions in this Report and I have made some amendments to the detailed wording of the MMs for clarity, consistency and effectiveness. None of these amendments significantly alters the content of the MMs as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and SA that has been undertaken. Where necessary, I have highlighted these amendments in the Report. None of the responses to the MM consultation raised matters requiring further oral Hearings.

## **Policies Map**

8. The Authorities must maintain adopted policies maps which illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a local plan for examination, the Authorities are required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted plan. In this case, the submission policies maps comprise the set of site plans contained within the SSR document.
9. None of the MMs to the SSR proposals recommended in this Report affect the policies maps. However, when the policy changes and site allocations of the SSR are adopted within the JMLP, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the policies, the Authorities will need to update their adopted policies maps to include all the SSR changes.

## **Context of the Soft Sand Review**

10. The Authorities are required to plan for a steady and adequate supply of minerals in accordance with paragraph 207 of the NPPF.
11. The West Sussex JMLP was jointly prepared by the Authorities and adopted in July 2018. The JMLP sets out strategic policies for a number of different types of mineral for the period to 2033.
12. During the examination of the JMLP in September 2017, concerns were raised about its strategy for the extraction of soft sand. On adoption, the JMLP was modified to delete references to planning for a declining amount of sand extraction from within the SDNP, to reword Policy M2 for Soft Sand and to delete a proposed allocation of the Ham Farm site from Policy M11.
13. As currently adopted, Policy M2 requires the Authorities to commence the Single Issue SSR within six months of the adoption of the JMLP and for the SSR to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination within two years of its commencement.
14. With respect to that part of the County of West Sussex that lies within the boundary of the SDNP, legislation<sup>1</sup> on the statutory purposes and duty for national parks requires that great weight be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP, which enjoys the highest level of policy protection.
15. The SSR considers three key issues of: the identified need for soft sand to the end date of the JMLP in 2033, options for meeting any identified shortfall in supply, and the identification of potential sites for the extraction of soft sand and their allocation if required.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, as amended by the Environment Act 1995

16. The SSR is limited to soft sand and is not required to consider any other mineral planning issue or to propose changes to any other part of the JMLP as currently adopted.
17. In practical terms, the SSR is not for adoption in its entirety as a separate development plan document but the changes it proposes, with the recommended MMs, will amend the JMLP with respect only to its strategy and provisions for the supply of soft sand.

## **Public Sector Equality Duty**

18. I have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. However, in connection with the limited scope of the SSR related to the extraction of a single mineral, I have detected no issue that would be likely to impinge upon the three aims of the Act to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations or affect persons of relevant protected characteristics such as age, disability, race or beliefs.
19. I find no reason to question the essential conclusion of the submitted Equalities Assessment that the SSR is not expected to discriminate against sections of the community. That is, given that the currently adopted JMLP includes policies to protect people from, and manage the negative social impacts associated with inappropriate minerals extraction (for example, loss of amenity space, increases in noise, dust, pollutants and traffic and general health and community safety concerns).

## **Assessment of the Duty to Co-operate**

20. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the joint Authorities complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the preparation of the SSR. This requires constructive, active and on-going engagement with local authorities and other prescribed bodies with respect to strategic matters affecting more than one planning area. It is necessary for the Authorities to demonstrate that the SSR, on submission, is compliant with this Duty to Co-operate (DtC).
21. The Authorities submitted evidence in connection with the DtC by way of a Duty to Co-operate Statement which accompanied the consultation draft SSR with an updating addendum on submission, followed by post-submission answers to initial questions posed by myself. This evidence demonstrates that, throughout the preparation of the SSR, the Authorities engaged with all other authorities and prescribed bodies, as applicable. These included neighbouring District and County Councils, East Sussex, Essex, Kent and Hampshire County Councils and many other more distant MPAs, as well as the Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England, Highways England, and the Marine Management Organisation. The Authorities are members of the South East England Aggregate Working Party (SEEAWP) on the co-ordination of the supply of aggregate minerals, including soft sand, involving both MPAs and mineral industry stakeholders.
22. Prior to the comparatively recent adoption of the JMLP in 2018, its preparation was found at examination to be compliant with the DtC. In that context, it is

appropriate that this assessment of the DtC should focus on the cross-boundary single strategic issue of soft sand provision.

23. The strategic priorities for soft sand are appropriately defined as maintaining an adequate supply against need identified in the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) and the identification of potential soft sand mineral sites. The LAA, amended since the submission of the SSR, is produced by the joint Authorities on evidence updated to 2019, including information gathered via membership of the SEEAWP. The allocation of three soft sand sites by the draft SSR is the outcome of targeted engagement between the several MPAs and correspondence with the prescribed bodies noted above. Judgements made on the selection of sites for allocation was evidently informed by consultation with the prescribed bodies, resulting in Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs).
24. An essentially factual Soft Sand Position Statement (former Soft Sand SoCG) between relevant MPAs notes significant landscape, environmental and recreational constraints upon soft sand extraction in the South East. It is also noted that the allocation of additional sites necessary to maintain the requisite steady and adequate supply requires a balance between the requirement for soft sand and conflict with these considerations. It is recognised that alternative marine or more distant land-based sources of soft sand are currently limited.
25. There is some evidence of increasing scope, through the life of the JMLP, for the importation of sea-dredged sands, potentially including soft sand, to contribute to the requirements identified by the annual LAA. At the same time, there are known problems of quality control with soft sand from that source. This therefore appears to be an area for careful consideration in future five-yearly reviews of the JMLP, with the aim of minimising the adverse impacts of the exploitation of land-based reserves. However, this does not amount to evidence of any failure in meeting the DtC in connection with this SSR, noting also that the SA has considered all potential sources of soft sand.
26. A SoCG between the Authorities and Kent and East Sussex County Councils and Brighton and Hove City Council agrees that planned provision, based on respective LAAs, should avoid National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) but that reserves may be worked to contribute to the needs of other areas. A potential soft sand surplus of 0.7 million tonnes identified in Kent could make a meaningful contribution to wider regional need, including that of West Sussex, recognising the constraints of the SDNP. That is, subject to annual LAA monitoring in Kent and any resulting review of the Kent Mineral Sites Plan. However, it is agreed that, in meeting the identified shortfall of the West Sussex LAA in practice, the joint Authorities will take account of the planned surplus in Kent. This agreement follows the examination of the Kent Mineral Sites Plan where the potential availability of a 0.7 million tonnes soft sand surplus was considered and is now acknowledged in that Plan, as now adopted.
27. A further SoCG between WSCC and the West Sussex Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) sets out the agreed positions on general matters relating to minerals planning, waste planning and other statutory and non-statutory functions and services provided by WSCC.

28. Some uncertainty remains as to whether any surplus soft sand in Kent would in practice be available to meet any shortfall in West Sussex. However, there is no obligation, in meeting the DtC to finalise agreement on every aspect of cross-boundary engagement. Any outstanding questions regarding the quantification of need, distribution of supply and choice of sites for soft sand extraction are matters for the Assessment of Soundness below and do not affect the judgement on the DtC as a legal requirement.
29. Overall, I am satisfied that, where necessary, the Authorities have engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the SSR and that the Duty to Co-operate has therefore been met.

## Consideration of Public Consultation

30. With respect to public consultation, at the time the SSR was submitted for examination, the Authorities stated that they were unable to make hard copies of Submission Documents available to the public, due to closure of deposit points during Covid19 restrictions, but would make them available as soon as reasonably practicable in terms of Regulation 22(3). In practice, legislation made in July 2020<sup>2</sup>, removes, on a temporary basis, the requirements on local planning authorities to make certain documents available for inspection at premises and to provide hard copies on request. The Authorities have made all documents available online, and made arrangements to meet any specific requests from interested parties and representors unable to access documents electronically. I am satisfied that, at the close of the Examination there has been no disadvantage to any party in this respect.
31. There is some outstanding public concern regarding the process of the preparation of the JMLP and the SSR. That is especially because the Ham Farm allocation was removed from the JMLP following the examination in 2018, when the Inspector concluded that the proposed strategy for soft sand was unsound. Ham Farm was then reallocated on the evidence supporting the SSR. This concern is understandable. However, public consultation on the SSR itself, as well as on the proposed MMs to it, was evidently carried out in compliance with the **Statements of Community Involvement** of the respective joint Authorities.

## Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance

32. The SSR has been prepared in accordance with the **Local Development Schemes** of the respective joint Authorities, as updated with respect to the projected date of adoption of its proposals.

---

<sup>2</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020

33. **Sustainability Appraisal (SA)** has been carried out on the SSR and the MMs and is adequate. The evidence contained within the SA is taken into account elsewhere in this Report.
34. The **Habitats Regulations Report** of September 2019 includes an Appropriate Assessment and concludes that, on information available at the plan preparation stage, the three allocation sites for soft sand are not expected to have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites, alone or in combination with other plans and projects. That is subject only to certain mitigation measures in connection with any future applications. These are to control sediment loading for the East of West Heath Extension and Chantry Lane Extension and project-level Appropriate Assessment to address impacts on bats, for the East of West Heath Extension and Chantry Lane Extension, and air quality for all three sites, as required by the respective development principles. An Addendum to the HRA confirms that none of the MMs would alter the conclusions of the submitted HRA.
35. The Development Plan, taken as a whole, including the adopted JMLP and the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP), contains a vision and objectives which address the **strategic priorities** for the development and use of land in West Sussex, which will naturally apply to the soft sand provisions of the SSR once adopted within the JMLP.
36. The Development Plan, taken as a whole, including the adopted JMLP and SDLP, contains policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in West Sussex contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, **climate change**. These policies will naturally encompass the soft sand provisions of the SSR, once adopted within the JMLP.
37. The SSR complies with all **other relevant legal requirements**, including the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations. Regulations 8(4) and 8(5) require that the proposals of the SSR be consistent with the development plan unless they are intended to supersede policies in the adopted development plan. That exception applies in this case and the relationship of the SSR to the JMLP, and thus to the development plan as a whole, is clearly stated in the submitted SSR document.



## Assessment of Soundness

### Main Issues

38. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the Examination Hearings, I have identified five main issues upon which the soundness of the SSR depends. This Report deals with these main issues. It does not respond to every point or issue raised by Representors.

### Issue 1 – Vision and Strategic Objectives

***Is the SSR based on an appropriate Vision and appropriate Objectives, taking into account those of the adopted JMLP and SDNP as well as national policy, legislation and guidance governing National Parks?***

39. The Vision and Strategic Objectives applicable to all mineral development in West Sussex are established within the adopted JMLP, taking account of national policy, legislation and guidance governing National Parks. The SSR considers a single issue, as expressly required by the currently adopted version of Policy M2 of the JMLP. The ultimate adoption of its proposals will not create a new development plan document but will amend the adopted JMLP. There is no requirement and no basis for the SSR to revisit the adopted overarching Vision and Strategic Objectives of the JMLP.
40. The Strategic Objectives include No1, relating generally to the prudent and efficient production and adequate and steady supply of minerals, No2 to prioritise the use of secondary and recycled aggregates over primary sources and No3, to make necessary provision for soft sand, among other land-won aggregates, from outside the SDNP where possible, only allowing development within the SDNP exceptionally and in the public interest.
41. Other Strategic Objectives establish a commitment to protect health and amenity, conserve and enhance the landscape of West Sussex and the special qualities of the SDNP and AONBs, protect the natural and historic environment, minimise flood risk and ensure high quality mitigation and restoration to appropriate after uses.
42. Consideration of whether, in practice, the SSR implements and is consistent with that Vision and those Strategic Objectives is inherent in the assessment that follows of the remaining matters of soundness.
43. However, for clarity, effectiveness and consistency with the adopted JMLP, **MM2** to Proposal SSR4 is necessary to correct an erroneous deletion from new paragraph 6.2.15 of a proper reference within Strategic Objective 1 to planning for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. It is noted that the consultation version of MM2, in terms of ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals, is not strictly consistent with paragraph 207 of the NPPF in this respect. However, proposed modified paragraph 6.2.15 of the JMLP merely repeats its earlier adopted Objectives 1 and 3 and a further amendment here would not be appropriate in the context of this single issue review.

44. Further, for full justification and effectiveness of the JMLP, **MM3** to Proposal SSR5 is also necessary. This inserts a footnote to make clear that the preferred soft sand provision from outside the SDNP should only derive from opportunities identified in adopted or emerging minerals plans or from existing permitted sites.

## **Issue 2 – Soft Sand Requirement**

### ***Is the Soft Sand requirement of the SSR soundly based on robust evidence and appropriately expressed?***

#### *Approach*

45. The SSR does not specify a precise soft sand requirement figure for the period of the JMLP. The Soft Sand Policy M2 merely provides for allowing allocated or unallocated sites, subject to a range of need, transportation and environmental criteria, in order to plan for a steady and adequate supply and maintain at least a seven year landbank related to the most recent LAA.
46. As submitted, the supporting text to Policy M2 provides an account of the demand and supply data from the 2018 LAA, indicating a range of predicted shortfall in supply over the period of the JMLP.
47. The shortfall range is calculated with reference to a series of demand scenarios, from simple reliance upon average prior sales over 10 years to an assumed future growth rate in housing construction in West Sussex; for that is the accepted main end use of soft sand.
48. Data on aggregate reserves is collated annually through surveys with quarry operators, conducted in conjunction with SEEAWP, and the outcomes provide information for individual LAAs. The latest reserves data for West Sussex is now set out in the 2019 LAA.
49. When based upon the ten-year average figures to 2019, in accordance with the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the annual soft sand sales figure is 0.29 million tonnes. The latest three-year trend is slightly higher. The LAA considers assumptions, also as advised by the PPG, that housing construction could grow and the LAA estimates that this could occur by up to 28.8%, based on planned housing provision in adopted and emerging development plans, as a primary development indicator. This results in a total requirement in the range of 4.04 to 5.21 million tonnes. Current reserves are estimated as 2.30 million tonnes, resulting in a net shortfall of between 1.74 and 2.91 million tonnes over the JMLP period to 2033.
50. The LAA states that West Sussex is a net exporter of soft sand on the basis of data from 2014 and the Authorities rightly accept that this occurs and that they are required to plan for a steady and adequate supply to meet the requirement, whether or not it is used within the JMLP area.
51. I consider that the basic approach of the SSR, as set out in the proposals for Policy M2 and its supporting text, is appropriate. It is also consistent with that of Policy M1 of the adopted JMLP for sharp sand and gravel, albeit no site allocations are deemed necessary for that mineral.

### *Other Development Indicators*

52. However, a number of other factors potentially affecting the requirement for soft sand through the JMLP period deserve consideration.
53. Notwithstanding the provisions of adopted development plans, there is an established Government imperative to boost housing supply by 300,000 homes per year nationally, compared with significantly lower outturns in past years. There is also evidence that the proportion of soft sand used in house construction is increasing. One estimate is that these factors could result in the upper end of the soft sand requirement range for West Sussex rising to as much as 6.55 million tonnes, representing a shortfall of 4.25 million tonnes during the JMLP period
54. With respect to the existing supply of permitted reserves; this relies on a relatively small number of sites, of which some are currently inactive, raising the question whether they will in practice contribute to the overall requirement, also implying a higher net shortfall figure.
55. Another factor is the degree to which soft sand reserves might increasingly be diverted to highly specialised end products unrelated to building, thus enlarging the overall upper requirement figure still derived from the uplift due to home construction.
56. Against these factors suggesting a greater requirement than predicted by the 2019 LAA, there is evidence of renewal of certain old mineral permissions with potential to yield soft sand.
57. It should also be taken into account that the current Covid19 pandemic restrictions will have caused a slowdown of construction and demand for soft sand.
58. All of these factors could have a greater or lesser influence upon the practical requirement for soft sand in West Sussex in the future years of the JMLP period. It is to be expected that current economic uncertainties following Brexit, together with the strictures of the ongoing Covid19 pandemic, will render the monitoring and prediction of aggregate requirements even less certain than hitherto. However, this Report is not the appropriate vehicle for conjecture as to whether the most recent LAA findings should be accepted in assessing SSR requirements. It is fundamental to the mineral planning process that, as laid down in Policy M2, the ongoing soft sand requirement is related to the LAA which will naturally take into account such economic and any resultant practical market fluctuations on an ongoing annual basis.
59. Moreover, the statutory requirement for five-yearly review of the JMLP and the PPG advice to rely upon an annual LAA to monitor demand and supply, together provide a proper basis for the Authorities to monitor ongoing requirement and manage supply, rather than attempting to predict a fixed requirement and provide for supply accordingly.
60. The current planning regime creates the appropriate opportunities for review of the JMLP in 2023, five years from adoption. In the meantime, market fluctuations, in particular any marked elevation in soft sand use in support of a boost in home construction, will manifest itself via emerging and adopted

development plan provisions to be taken into account in the annual LAA. There is no basis to assume a sudden increase in house building in West Sussex which, for the time being at least, depends upon the calculation methodology of the NPPF and PPG, and not upon a direct application of the broad national objective. Any depletion or increase in permitted reserves would also be monitored.

61. As for the effect of the pandemic, this is unpredictable but it must be noted that the Government remains committed to revitalising the economy and medical advances show signs of making way for this, such that any negative influence of the pandemic could be reversed over the life of the JMLP.

### *Conclusions on Soft Sand Requirement*

62. The preparation of the SSR has evidently followed the advice of the PPG on Minerals, regarding the completion of and reliance upon LAAs in minerals planning. Further, the LAA has been considered by the SEEAWP, in compliance with the DtC, as noted above.
63. Proposal SSR3 is appropriate in inserting a new text paragraph 6.2.14, setting out the 2018 LAA need and landbank figures, subject to amendment to substitute the more recent figures of the 2019 LAA. This is achieved by **MM1**, as published, but this requires further amendment to make clear that the figures are taken from the 2019 LAA and to state expressly the shortfall range that follows from the difference between the demand and supply totals.
64. Subject those changes, I conclude that the soft sand requirement of the SSR, and the JMLP, once modified in accordance with it, is soundly based on robust evidence and appropriately expressed.
65. In reaching this conclusion I disregard any implication that the calculated requirement for soft sand in West Sussex should be influenced by planning constraints on potential extraction sites or their likely practical yield, particularly where these might lie within the boundary of the SDNP, given the specially protected status of its landscape. That would inappropriately conflate requirement and supply. Whether the SSR provides effectively to meet the calculated requirement in its selection of sites is for the remaining issues considered below.

## **Issue 3 – Site Selection Process**

### ***Are the site allocations of the SSR soundly based upon a robust site selection process?***

#### *Strategy*

66. Fundamentally, minerals can only be worked where they occur and soft sand resources in West Sussex lie geologically within the Folkstone Formation and largely within the SDNP.
67. The Authorities considered five supply strategy options for soft sand; A, from sites within West Sussex outside the SDNP; B, from sites within West Sussex but including the SDNP; C, from sites outside West Sussex; D, from alternative sources; and E, from a combination of all those four options.

68. There is no substantive dispute that the chosen Option E is the most reasonable and logical in terms of identifying a sufficient amount and certainty of supply considering all available sources.
69. The adopted JMLP includes five guiding principles for the selection of mineral sites. These are related to (1) opportunities for beneficial restoration, (2) environmental sensitivity and protection of amenity, (3) good access to the Lorry Route Network, (4) landscape protection and (5) avoidance of sterilisation of minerals. The SSR adds a further guiding principle of a preference for extensions to existing sites, subject to cumulative impact assessment. Whilst the site allocations of the SSR are regarded by some as contrary to its own guiding principles, these properly contribute to the basis for a planning balance to be achieved between competing harms and benefits. They cannot practically be taken as placing an absolute prohibition on any given potential soft sand site.

### *Major Development*

70. Soft sand extraction is a type of operation regarded as major development in the NPPF and in legislation<sup>3</sup>. Under paragraph 172 and Footnote 55 of the NPPF, where a decision maker judges a proposal in the SDNP to represent major development, permission should not be granted other than in exceptional circumstances and where the development is demonstrably in the public interest. Consideration of major development should include assessment of need and local economy, cost and alternatives, and detriment to the environment, landscape and recreation. Otherwise, what constitutes major development is not defined in national policy.
71. Proposals for major development within the SDNP are subject to Core Policy SD3 of the adopted SDLP 2019 in the same terms as paragraph 172 of the NPPF. The Policy provides that, in determining whether a proposal for soft sand extraction constitutes major development, the SDNPA will consider whether, by reason of scale, character or nature, it has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the natural beauty, wildlife, cultural heritage or recreational opportunities of the SDNP, including cumulatively with other development.
72. According to the *Advearse*<sup>4</sup> case in 2020, this judgement will not always be a one-off event but the expectation is that it will be made in successive stages from local plan formulation through to the determination of a specific application at a different level of detail. While the decision on such an application may reasonably take account of the conclusions previously reached by the local plan Inspector, detailed further consideration will be required.
73. Thus, under Core Policy SD3, any proposal for soft sand extraction within the SDNP boundary, whether from an allocated or an unallocated site, if judged

---

<sup>3</sup> Town and County Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015

<sup>4</sup> R (Advearse) v Dorset CC et al [2020] EWHC 807 (Admin) Paragraph 46

by the SDNPA to constitute major development by itself or cumulatively, could be refused at the application stage. It would be for the SDNP to judge whether, on consideration of the details of the specific application, exceptional circumstances and public interest would justify approval.

74. Clearly, this policy and this legal position have a bearing upon the practical deliverability of either of the soft sand allocations of the SSR within the SDNP, once incorporated in the adopted JMLP.
75. Therefore, following the approach advocated in the *Advearse* case, the Authorities provided a Major Development Background Paper, firstly, to assess whether a shortlist of nine potential soft sand extraction sites would constitute major development within the SDNP and, secondly, to scope the ability of shortlisted sites within the SDNP to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and public interest at a high level as part of the plan making process.
76. I consider that the evidence of this Major Development Assessment is properly to be taken into account as an appropriate part of the site selection process and in considering, under Issue 5 (*below*), the adequacy of the supply provided by the SSR.

#### *Selection Methodology*

77. The Authorities followed a five-stage site selection methodology, which was found sound in 2017 by the Inspector examining now adopted JMLP. The Authorities therefore applied the same criteria and colour coded red-amber-green (RAG) traffic light system for assessing and comparing sites in the preparation of the SSR.
78. Following a call for soft sand sites in 2018 a long list of all known potential sites, numbering 21 in all, was drawn up at Stage 1. Twelve were ruled out at Stage 2 on grounds of non-availability or non-viability, leaving a short list of nine for detailed assessment and SA at Stages 3-5, which included the Regulation 18 Issues and Options consultation.
79. The nine shortlisted sites were: Buncton Manor Farm, East of West Heath Common Extension, Minsted West, East and West Severals, Duncton Common, Coopers Moor, Chantry Lane Extension and Ham Farm.
80. The Authorities carried out Habitats Regulations, transport, landscape and flood risk assessments of the nine shortlisted sites to inform the ultimate selection over the range of twelve environmental criteria including landscape, visual and cumulative impacts as well as access and air and soil quality.
81. Under the Major Development Assessment, all nine shortlisted sites were considered likely to be regarded as major development and all but seven were located inside the SDNP. The assessment identifies the issues and considerations to be taken into account in deciding whether exceptional circumstances would justify approval of a future application. These included the level of need, existing supply and alternatives according to the current LAA, as well as detailed site-specific criteria. The assessment stops short of indicating whether an application for any of the seven the shortlisted sites inside the SDNP would potentially be refused on grounds of lack of exceptional justification.

82. At Stage 5 of the selection process, the Buncton Manor Farm site was excluded in principle on grounds of unacceptable adverse impact on key views of Chanctonbury Hill.
83. Thus, on this new assessment, five sites emerged as acceptable in principle: Chantry Lane Extension (Storrington), East of West Heath Common Extension (Rogate), Ham Farm (Steyning and Wiston), Minsted West and Severals East and West (Midhurst).
84. Ham Farm is the sole site of the remaining five which is outside the SDNP. The sites East of West Heath Common and at Chantry Lane would be extensions, in that they would utilise the processing facilities of their parent existing sites, with potential for improved restoration of the original sites. This is in line with the additional principle preferring extensions over new sites, subject to consideration of cumulative impact. By comparison, new sites at Severals East and West were less favoured on grounds of greater impact on the SDNP, whilst Minsted West was considered by the Authorities to be less able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and public interest.
85. The SSR accordingly allocates the three sites at Ham Farm, Chantry Lane and East of West Heath Common.

#### *Alternative Resources*

86. There is no evidence to indicate that there remain other viable soft sand resources within those parts of West Sussex outside the SDNP. Any change in this respect would be reported via the annual LAA and, in turn, lead to an adjustment in the overall requirement for soft sand from natural reserves, year-on-year.
87. Neither is there any substantive evidence that soft sand, as a relatively highly specialised mineral in its end uses and quality requirements, could be provided from recycled or secondary aggregate sources.

#### *Transportation*

88. Whilst soft sand is transported by road across the West Sussex border in response to detailed market circumstances, the SSR, as submitted, and hence the JMLP, would not be reliant upon importation to meet the identified soft sand requirement.

#### *Conclusions on Site Selection Process*

89. The judgements made and tabulated in the Site Selection Report are necessarily subjectively based upon the professional judgements, experience and local knowledge of officers and members of the Authorities. The conclusions reached appear broadly reasonable.
90. Accordingly, I conclude that the approach and methodology of the site selection process is sound in itself.
91. However, it remains, under Issue 5 (*below*), to consider each of the three allocated sites in more specific detail as to whether they would be acceptable

in practice and would together deliver a supply of soft sand to contribute sufficiently to meeting identified requirements.

#### **Issue 4 – Policy M2: Soft Sand**

##### ***Is the detailed proposed wording of Policy M2 justified, effective and sound?***

92. Policy M2 of the JMLP as currently adopted, merely sets out broad criteria for the approval of soft sand applications and commits the Authorities to undertaking this SSR. Therefore, proposal SSR13 of the SSR replaces the adopted wording of Policy M2 with specific criteria.
93. Criterion (a) permits soft sand extraction where (i) it is needed to maintain a steady and adequate supply and a minimum seven year landbank according to the latest LAA, (ii) the site is allocated by Policy M11 or the need cannot be met by an allocated site and (iii) the site is well related to the Lorry Route Network.
94. Criterion (b) states that soft sand sites outside the SDNP must not impact adversely upon its setting.
95. Criterion (c) states that soft sand sites inside the SDNP that constitute major development will be refused other than in exceptional circumstances and in the public interest.
96. Criterion (a) gives rise to the question whether the requirement to maintain a minimum seven year landbank of soft sand sites in West Sussex should expressly apply to the whole of the life of the adopted JMLP to 2033. However, it is widely recognised that the wording of national policy makes no such stipulation. Moreover, with statutory five-yearly review of the JMLP and soft sand requirement defined in terms of the annual LAA, Policy M2 is properly to be regarded as compliant with national policy in this regard.
97. Criterion (c) implies a negative presumption, even against the extraction of soft sand from sites allocated inside the SDNP by Policy M11, where it is considered at the application stage to amount to major development and the exceptional circumstances and public interest tests are judged not to be met. Whilst this may be seen as running against the broad national presumption in favour of sustainable development, nevertheless the wording of Criterion (c) properly reflects the law and policy provisions for major development in the SDNP referenced above.
98. The question of the implications of the constraint imposed by Policy M2(c) for the supply of soft sand is for Issue 5 regarding Policy M11.
99. In itself, I consider that the amended Policy M2, as set out in Proposal SSR13, is justified and effective in its wording and accordingly sound.



## **Issue 5 – Policy M11: Strategic Minerals Site Allocations**

***Will the sites allocated by the SSR contribute sufficiently to the requisite supply and landbank of soft sand, based upon justified and effective development principles according to the planning considerations and constraints at each site?***

### ***General Issues***

100. The overall main issues in connection with Policy M11, as amended by Proposal SSR30, are: whether the three allocated sites, at Ham Farm, East of West Heath Common and at Chantry Lane, would contribute sufficiently to the requisite supply and landbank of soft sand through the JMLP period; and whether the development principles (DPs) stated for each site are appropriate, justified and potentially effective, having regard to the range of planning considerations, constraints and impacts arising in each case, as assessed below.
101. Whilst the allocated sites are considered individually, common issues arise in connection with all three, in particular regarding policy to enhance biodiversity and with respect to impact upon hydrogeology.

### ***All Allocated Sites***

#### ***Biodiversity***

102. Policy M17 of the adopted JMLP, by Criteria (b) and (e), resists unacceptable impacts on biodiversity and seeks net gains where possible. Since that provision became part of the adopted development plan, national policy, including paragraphs 170 and 174 of the NPPF, has shifted to require expressly the pursuit of opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. To that extent, JMLP Policy M17 is no longer fully consistent with national policy.
103. Notably, Policy M24(c) of the JMLP does require restoration of mineral sites to maximise biodiversity gain, whilst Strategic Policy 9(1)(b) of the SDLP does require development to identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity. These provisions provide sufficient cover over any mineral development proposal in West Sussex, consistent with the national policy to seek opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.
104. It is appropriate in the circumstances to future-proof the proposals of the SSR for Policy M11, prior to adoption within the JMLP, and it would be desirable that the JMLP itself should be made internally consistent. However, it is outside the scope of this Report to recommend modifications to Policy M17 or any other policies of the adopted JMLP, apart from M2 and M11 where they relate to soft sand.
105. At the same time, the SSR proposals are for the three major mineral development allocations of the JMLP as a whole. Accordingly, in the interests of effectiveness and soundness, I consider that changes should be made to the DPs for all three allocations, consistent with current national policy to seek opportunities to provide for an overall enhancement of biodiversity. This requires the addition of a new DP and consequent renumbering.

106. It will be for the five-yearly review of the whole JMLP to rectify any inconsistency between its provisions and national policy at that point. In the relatively short meantime, the NPPF covers the relative weight to be accorded national policy over any local development plan provision judged to be inconsistent with it.

#### *Hydrogeology*

107. With respect to hydrogeology, for the DPs for each site to be effective and sound, it is appropriate to insert a requirement to avoid impact on hydrogeology, rather than merely to minimise any such impact.
108. Where there is wet woodland within an allocation site boundary, as in the case of the East of West Heath Common Extension, it is appropriate to provide in the DPs for limiting the practical extent of excavation. However, depending on the site-specific evidence, such a stipulation is not necessarily required in every case and there is no inconsistency where there are resulting differences in the respective DPs.

#### *Trees and Hedgerows*

109. The DPs for all three allocated sites, as submitted, set a general requirement that existing trees and hedgerows should where possible be retained and reinforced to create corridors of mature and newly planted trees and vegetation. For the SSR and the JMLP to be fully effective and sound, the DPs should impose an obligation that mineral development must, rather than should, retain trees and hedgerows where possible.

#### *Changes Applying to the DPs for All Allocated Sites*

110. All the foregoing necessary changes generally required to the DPs are included within **MM5** to New Paragraph 7.2.9 for the allocation East of West Heath Common, **MM6** to New Paragraph 7.2.7 for Ham Farm and **MM7** to New Paragraph 7.2.11 for Chantry Lane.

### ***Ham Farm, Steyning (Policies Map 8)***

#### *Description*

111. The site comprises approximately 7.9ha of agricultural land just outside the SDNP on the north side of the A283 west of Steyning. The estimated yield set out in the SSR is 0.725 million tonnes of soft sand. Restoration could include restoration to the original site profile and agricultural use, potentially with some woodland enhancement.
112. Proposal SSR34 introduces a new paragraph 7.2.6 providing a general description of the site and its prospective restoration, whilst Proposal SSR35 adds new paragraph 7.2.7 which sets out a range of DPs for soft sand extraction from the site.

#### *Transportation*

113. The allocation site lies on the inside of a bend on a section the main A283 with a significant accident record where an additional access for mineral traffic

is not desirable. Evidently, however, an access could be provided at the position of the present entrance gate compliant with established geometric highway standards with no objection to the allocation from the highway authority, providing direct access to the main lorry route. This is specified by DP(xvi) as submitted.

- 114. The potential restoration of the site to agriculture at its original level by importation filling material need not generate additional lorry traffic via the site entrance if export and import trips were co-ordinated using the same vehicles, as is accepted operational practice.
- 115. DP(xiv) as submitted requires an agreed lorry routeing agreement to be implemented and monitored, avoiding trips via Steyning and Storrington.
- 116. There is no evidence at this plan preparation stage of an overriding highway objection where the need for soft sand from the site is demonstrated.

#### *Trees and Landscape*

- 117. The site is largely surrounded by established woodland and bounded by mature trees and hedgerows. There is an internal hedgerow within the south western part of the site to be retained. Landscape Assessment concludes that the site has medium sensitivity to and moderate capacity for accommodating mineral extraction. DPs(ii) and (iii) require a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment at the application stage, whilst DP (iv) specifies that the access design would ensure the retention and protection of mature broadleaf trees. DP(vi) requires landscaped boundary screen mounding at the eastern and southern boundaries. In this way, the landscape impact of necessary soft sand extraction could be acceptably mitigated.

#### *Heritage and Amenity - Noise and Light Pollution*

- 118. The proposed landscape mitigation measures would also help to address considerations of heritage and amenity which considerably constrain the site. DP(ix) requires an impact assessment of nearby listed buildings, including Horsebrook Cottage and Wappington Manor, to identify any further necessary mitigation measures. DP(xx) requires a detailed noise, dust odour and vibration management plan to be agreed and implemented, setting out how such impacts would be avoided or mitigated.
- 119. There would still be noticeable changes to the living conditions at adjacent properties, including Hammes Farm and the studio there, in particular regarding their outlook where boundary mounding were necessary. However, the degree of adverse impact could be limited in planning terms and would be weighed in the planning balance with the wider public benefit of meeting identified soft sand requirements.

#### *High Quality Agricultural Land*

- 120. It is currently not known whether the site is overlain by Grade 3b agricultural soils or the higher quality Grade 3a or above, resulting in a potential significant adverse environmental impact according to the SA. Accordingly DP(xviii) requires mitigation measures for any loss of such soils. In normal

practice, soils would not be removed from the site but stockpiled for restoration to agriculture.

### *Yield and Viability*

121. The commercial viability of the site for soft sand extraction is not directly related to the acceptability of the site in planning terms, albeit most relevant to the adequacy of supply to meet LAA requirements. However, to allocate a site based on a significant overestimate of yield could lead to unnecessary planning blight and uncertainty to local residents.
122. In this regard, the claimed potential yield of 0.725 million tonnes is questioned with reference to the geological investigation report published by the prospective operator. This estimates the yield based on a mean depth of sand over the net developable area after deduction of retained trees and hedgerows. Allowance is also made for buffer zones to maintain screening and critical excavation slope stability, especially against the main A283. The question is raised whether the deductions made are sufficient, especially regarding the slope angles and the assumed depth of sand when closely analysed on borehole results.
123. At the same time, a specialist technical review for the prospective operators, whilst confirming the stated yield figure of the SSR, foresees a potentially higher figure due to areas of deeper deposits than the assumed mean. Estimates vary from some 34% below the stated 0.725 million tonnes to some degree above it. The operator remains confident of the broad estimated tonnage, assuming progressive restoration avoiding temporary side slopes being exposed for long periods.
124. On balance, the yield of the allocation site assumed by the SSR appears reasonable.

### *Cumulative Impact*

125. The Transport Assessment identifies no unacceptable cumulative highway impacts resulting from the potential mineral development of the allocation site, including a cluster of sites along the A283.
126. More generally DP(xvii), as amended to DP(xviii) by **MM6**, sets a clear requirement for a detailed assessment of cumulative impact in connection with any application.

## ***East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9)***

### *Description*

127. The site comprises 14ha of agricultural land at Rogate, some distance east of the existing site, within the SDNP. The estimated yield set out in the SSR is 0.95 million tonnes of soft sand. Extraction would be linked to the existing site with material transported for processing via a conveyor or pipeline crossing the intervening land and intersecting with Public Footpath 861. Restoration in conjunction with the existing site would be to a low-level water environment for nature conservation and informal recreation with improvement to long distance trails and rights of way.

128. Proposal SSR36 introduces a new paragraph 7.2.8 providing a general description of the site and its prospective restoration, whilst Proposal SSR38 adds new paragraph 7.2.9 which sets out a range of DPs for soft sand extraction from the site.

*Trees and Hedgerows, Ecology and Hydrogeology*

129. Neither the supporting text nor the DPs include specific reference to impact on West Heath Common itself or the adjacent River Rother Local Wildlife Site. For the SSR and the JMLP to be fully effective and sound, paragraph 7.2.8 should stipulate avoidance and minimisation of such impact.
130. A southern part of the allocation site is wet woodland where Blackrye Pond and a Victorian drainage system are located. It is likely that earthworks for soft sand extraction in this area would be impractical and harmful, depending on the findings of a detailed hydrogeological survey. As a result, the extent of earthworks within the boundary of the allocation could be curtailed. That is not to say that the allocation boundary itself needs to be altered on the Policies Map. However, for clarity and effectiveness, this matter should be made clear within paragraph 7.2.8 and DP(viii) as submitted should be similarly amended.
131. All these necessary changes are made by **MM4** and **MM5**.

*Transportation and Public Rights of Way*

132. The Transport Assessment concludes that the site has a high overall highway suitability in terms of access via the existing site entrance off Durford Lane, with moderate negative impact on public rights of way. There is no technical evidence to indicate otherwise in the broad context of the highway or rights of way network.
133. However, there are local concerns, based upon experience of the existing aggregate extraction works. The nearby Sky Park Farm Visitor Centre generates similar traffic flows to the mineral development and there has been damage to Durford Bridge near the site entrance. Pedestrian and cycle use of Durford Lane is increasing, encouraged by ongoing enhancement to the local bridleway network.
134. Most particularly, there could be conflict walkers and the projected conveyor or pipeline to transport mineral from the extension to the present site for processing, as this would cross Public Footpath 861, a major public right of way over open land outside the allocation boundary.
135. However, the Transport Assessment takes account of all predicted traffic flows and, whilst the continued use of Durford Lane and Durford Bridge by mineral traffic is clearly not desirable, such use is evidently within the traffic and weight carrying capacity of the Bridge and the Lane, with no additional adverse comment from the highway authority. At this stage of plan preparation, there is no evident insurmountable planning objection on traffic grounds where overriding need for soft sand is demonstrated.
136. The projected use of a conveyor or pipeline would contribute beneficially to non-motorised transport and there is scope for accommodation or temporary

diversion of the public right of way to minimise any conflict. This is advocated by DP(xii) as submitted, which states that consideration should be given to ensuring such mitigation measures but, to be effective and sound, this needs to be modified to state that such consideration must be given. The necessary change is put into effect by **MM5**.

### *Heritage*

137. The site is relatively close to scheduled ancient monuments and DP(vi), as submitted, draws attention to the need for their protection from adverse impacts. along with highway bridges and structures where relevant. Any application would also be judged on merit against the requirements of Policy M14 of the JMLP that mineral development record, conserve or enhance heritage assets, unless there are overriding reasons in favour of the mineral extraction.

### *Noise and Light Pollution*

138. There is always potential for noise and light pollution to arise from mineral workings, affecting the amenity of local residents and impinging upon the special qualities of the SDNP. However, there is no indication that the conveyor or pipeline would require external illumination and these potential impacts due to the extraction site itself are addressed by DP(xi), requiring a lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan, as well as by DPs(ii) and (iii) to provide a landscape impact assessment.
139. Sand extraction would also be subject to adopted development management provisions. These include Policy M18 of the JMLP, protecting public health and amenity by restricting working hours, and Strategic Policy SD8 of the SDLP, to conserve and enhance the intrinsic dark night skies of the SDNP. This limits unavoidable lighting to no more than the appropriate level. Given the Landscape Assessment places the site in the lowest category of visual sensitivity, these measures are likely to prove sufficient, on balance, where need for the soft sand is demonstrated.

### *Cumulative Impact, Landscape Impact, Restoration and Public Access.*

140. The application of the guiding principle of preferring extensions to new sites is not immediately evident in this case, with a half-kilometre open, rural gap between the allocation site and the existing works. However, the proposed conveyor system would avoid road transport between the two and facilitate processing via the existing plant and use of the existing access. The potential cumulative impact of the mineral development on the allocated site is assessed by the SA as minor negative.
141. That is of little comfort to local residents who perceive a prolongation of mineral workings in their neighbourhood, impeding access and delaying restoration of the existing site, and visible in views from public rights of way within the SDNP.
142. However, the potential cumulative impact of the mineral development on the allocated site is assessed by the SA as minor negative and DP(ii), as submitted, would ensure that development proposals necessary in the wider public interest would take account of a landscape visual assessment.

### *Site Liaison Group*

143. For internal consistency with the other two allocations and effectiveness, DP(xiii), as submitted, should be subdivided to provide a separate requirement for the establishment of a Site Liaison Group, to include the local community. This change is put into effect within **MM5**.

### ***Chantry Lane Extension, Storrington (Policies Map 10)***

#### *Description*

144. The site comprises approximately 2.5ha of agricultural land located just south east of Storrington, within the SDNP. The estimated yield set out in the SSR is 1 million tonnes of soft sand. Extraction would be linked to the existing adjacent site with restoration to agriculture, including potential woodland and public rights of way enhancement.
145. Proposal SSR39 introduces a new paragraph 7.2.10 providing a general description of the site and its prospective restoration, whilst Proposal SSR40 adds a new paragraph 7.2.11 which sets out a range of DPs for soft sand extraction from the site.

#### *Transportation*

146. The Transport Assessment considers the site acceptable in transport terms with any application subject to the requirements of Policy M20 of the JMLP, including optimal lorry use and routeing. The site is located at the edge of Storrington, away from the centre, and is on the advisory lorry route network, such that unacceptable impact could be avoided.

#### *Landscape*

147. The Landscape Assessment concludes that the site has medium sensitivity and moderate capacity for mineral extraction and recommends mitigation measures that informed the DPs. As submitted, these include DPs(ii) and (iii) for landscape and visual impact assessment, DP(iv) on entrance design to minimise impact on the SDNP, DP(v) to provide for perimeter screen mounding during the works and DP(xvi) for restoration to be informed by an agreed landscape and ecosystem services-led strategy.

#### *Pollution and Amenity*

148. Any mineral application for the Chantry Lane allocation would be subject to detailed pollution assessments, including with respect to noise and light, whilst DP(xv), as submitted, requires an agreed management plan dealing with these potential impacts. There is no evidence that these impacts could not be adequately controlled where, on a balance of judgement, the development were essential.

#### *High Quality Agricultural Land*

149. The site could contain some Grade 3 soils of high quality. DP(xiii), as submitted, requires any loss of high quality agricultural land to be minimised and mitigated. Any planning application for the site would be judged against

JMLP Policy M15 on air and soil, avoiding unacceptable impact on the quality of soils.

### *Cumulative Impact*

150. The Transport Assessment identifies no unacceptable cumulative highway impacts resulting from the potential mineral development of the allocation site, including a cluster of sites along the A283.
151. More generally DP(xii), as amended to DP(xiii) by **MM7**, sets a clear requirement for a detailed assessment of cumulative impact in connection with any application.

### ***Conclusions on Policy 11 and the Site Allocations***

152. There is understandable general concern in connection with all three allocated sites that the DPs should be more extensive and specific in terms of the detailed nature and control of any soft sand extraction which ultimately takes place and the subsequent restoration and afteruse of the land under future planning applications.
153. However, the stipulations required at the relatively high level of plan preparation level are to be distinguished from the tighter controls that will potentially be necessary in practice with respect to actual planning permissions. These would include such as precise access arrangements, phasing of earthworks, hours of operation, lorry routeing and phasing. Discretion is thus appropriately left to the Authorities to consider and consult publicly upon individual proposals, on merit and within the framework set by the policies of the JMLP and the DPs set down for each allocation.
154. Other controls exist under separate legislation with respect to engineering practice during earthworks and sand extractions regarding on-site and public safety.
155. I conclude from the discussion above that the range of potential planning impacts of sand extraction from the three allocations could be substantively addressed by mitigatory measures required by the DPs respectively set down for the sites, subject to the necessary MMs I have identified in the interests of soundness.
156. I further conclude that such mineral development could be justified on balance within the policy framework of the adopted JMLP and SDLP. That would include proposals where soft sand extraction within the SDNP would potentially meet the exception and public interest tests of Core Policy SD3 of the SDLP with respect to major development.
157. The remaining question is whether the three sites would yield sufficient quantities of soft sand to meet the supply shortfall currently identified of between 1.74 and 2.91 million tonnes over the JMLP period to 2033.
158. Whilst the estimated yield figures published for Ham Farm and Chantry Lane are questioned, the Authorities appropriately followed established practice in obtaining this information for all identified sites from the mineral industry via



the call for sites for the SSR and from information previously held from the preparation of the JMLP.

159. According to the evidence thus provided by the Authorities within the SSR itself and reviewed under Issue 3 (*above*), the total yield of the allocations should amount to about 2.67 million tonnes, well above the median shortfall estimate of some 2.32 million tonnes.
160. In the event that yields were compromised by the physical limitations of the sites affecting their commercial viability, the allocations would still make a valuable contribution to supply. In a hypothetical case of the Ham Farm site not proceeding at all due to alleged yield issues and the Chantry Lane extension reaching only, say, 75% of its predicted yield of 1 million tonnes, the total outturn would still amount around 1.7 million tonnes, equivalent to the lower end of the range of estimated shortfall as currently estimated.
161. The planning system should provide reasonable certainty as to future mineral development and this SSR to some extent leaves open the question of whether, in the face of the range of planning constraints which exist, its proposals would provide for the requisite steady and adequate supply of soft sand to maintain a seven-year landbank.
162. However, the process of statutory five yearly review of the JMLP, coupled with the annual monitoring of requirement and supply provided by the LAA, linked to policy M2, provides a substantial measure of compensation for any degree of immediate uncertainty. I am therefore led to the view that, in the context of West Sussex and the SDNP, that the sites allocated by the SSR can properly be regarded as contributing sufficiently to the requisite supply and landbank of soft sand for West Sussex and that, in this respect, Policy M11 of the JMLP, as amended by this SSR would be justified, effective and sound, subject to the MMs I have identified.

## Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

163. The SSR has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend its non-adoption as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explained in the main issues set out above.
164. The Authorities have requested that I recommend MMs to make the SSR sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that the Duty to Co-operate has been met and that, with the recommended Main Modifications set out in the Appendix to this Report, the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan Single Issue Soft Sand Review satisfies the requirements referred to in Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and is sound.

*B J Sims*

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an **Appendix** containing the **Main Modifications**

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX

### RECOMMENDED MAIN MODIFICATIONS

SMM No	SSR No	JMLP Para/ Policy	Submitted SSR	Recommended Main Modification
<b>MM1</b>	SSR3	6.2.13	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.14.</b></p> <p>The current 10 year average sales value is much higher than for sharp sand and gravel, at 293,737 tonnes per annum (2008 – 2017), and other relevant local information suggests average demand may be as high as 372,459 tonnes per annum. Total permitted reserve of land-won soft sand in West Sussex is 2,754,000 which currently provides a landbank of 7.4 years, based on the 10 year average sales, taking account of other relevant local information. Current reserves are not sufficient to meet demand over the Plan period (up to 2033). Planning Guidance (NPPG, para 064) states that MPA's should also consider average sales over the previous three years, to identify the general trend of demand. The 3-year average of soft sand sales is 295,115 tonnes (2015-2017). Based on this 3-year average and current reserves, the landbank (taking account of other relevant local information) is currently 9.3 years.</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.14.</b></p> <p>The current 10 year average sales value is much higher than for sharp sand and gravel, at <del>293,737</del> 288,718 tonnes per annum (<del>2008–2017</del> <b>2009-2019</b>), and other relevant local information suggests average demand may be as high as <del>372,459</del> <b>371,869</b> tonnes per annum. Total permitted reserve of land-won soft sand in West Sussex is <del>2,754,000</del> <b>2,300,437</b> which currently provides a landbank of <del>7.4</del> <b>6.2</b> years, based on the 10 year average sales, taking account of other relevant local information. Current reserves are not sufficient to meet demand over the Plan period (up to 2033). Planning Guidance (NPPG, para 064) states that MPA's should also consider average sales over the previous three years, to identify the general trend of demand. The 3-year average of soft sand sales is <del>295,115</del> <b>315,560</b> tonnes (<del>2015–2017</del> <b>2016-2019</b>). Based on this 3-year average and current reserves, the landbank (taking account of other relevant local information) is currently <del>9.3</del> <b>7.3</b> years.</p>
<b>MM2</b>	SSR4	6.2.14	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.15.</b></p> <p>The relevant strategic objectives are:</p> <p>1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals <del>and to ensure a steady and adequate supply</del>, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area.</p> <p>3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.15.</b></p> <p>The relevant strategic objectives are:</p> <p>1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals <u>and to ensure a steady and adequate supply</u>, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area.</p> <p>3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.</p>
<b>MM3</b>	SSR5	New para 6.2.16	<p>In order to inform the strategy for the provision of land won soft sand, the Authorities considered the opportunities for extraction:</p> <p>within West Sussex but outside of the SDNP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ outside of West Sussex</li> <li>▪ from other sources</li> <li>▪ from within the SDNP, within West Sussex</li> <li>▪ a combination of the options</li> </ul>	<p>In order to inform the strategy for the provision of land won soft sand, the Authorities considered the opportunities for extraction:</p> <p>within West Sussex but outside of the SDNP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ outside of West Sussex<sup>1</sup></li> <li>▪ from other sources</li> <li>▪ from within the SDNP, within West Sussex</li> <li>▪ a combination of the options</li> </ul> <p><u>Footnote 1: where these opportunities are included in emerging or adopted mineral plans, or exist as sites that hold current planning permissions.</u></p>
<b>MM4</b>	SSR36	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.8.</b></p> <p><b>East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9):</b> Located near to Rogate, Chichester, the extension to West Heath Quarry is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 14 hectares in size and would provide 950,000 tonnes of soft sand. Materials would be exported from the extension site to the existing quarry by conveyor or pipeline, for processing, before transport by road using the existing quarry access and routing provision. Development of this site should contribute to the Petersfield to Pulborough via Midhurst non-motorised route. The after use for this site would be to create a low level water environment that should maximise nature conservation and informal recreation. Any restoration scheme should be fully integrated with the restoration scheme on the existing site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>Footnote 1: SSR Landscape Assessment (2019).</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.8.</b></p> <p><b>East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9):</b> Located near to Rogate, Chichester, the extension to West Heath Quarry is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 14 hectares in size and would provide 950,000 tonnes of soft sand. <u>The area available for extraction may be limited by the development principles set out below, including the results of the hydrogeological survey.</u> Materials would be exported from the extension site to the existing quarry by conveyor or pipeline, for processing, before transport by road using the existing quarry access and routing provision. Development of this site <u>should avoid and minimise any impact on West Heath Common and the River Rother Local Wildlife Site.</u> <u>Development should also</u> contribute to the Petersfield to Pulborough via Midhurst non-motorised route. The after use for this site would be to create a low level water environment that should maximise nature conservation and informal recreation. Any restoration scheme should be fully integrated with the restoration scheme on the existing site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>1</sup>.</p>

## West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan Soft Sand Review - Examination Report January 2021 - Appendix

80

SMM No	SSR No	JMLP Para/ Policy	Submitted SSR	Recommended Main Modification
				Footnote 1: SSR Landscape Assessment (2019).
<b>MM5</b>	SSR38	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.9.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the East of West Heath Common site are as follows:</p> <p>i. A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p>ii. A landscape and visual impact assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site (including the use of conveyors or pipeline), taking into account and seeking to minimise adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p>iii. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p>iv. Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, should, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p>v. There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p>vi. Proposals should ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the nearby Scheduled Monuments bridges and structures on relevant parts of the road network;</p> <p>vii. At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p>viii. A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including the River Rother SNCI;</p> <p>ix. The potential for impact on the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and East Hampshire Hangers SAC should be considered, and mitigation applied to ensure no harm occurs;</p> <p>x. Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p>xi. A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p>xii. Consideration should be given to ensuring mitigation measures are applied to Public Footpath 861, which is 500m west of the site, and may be impacted by the use of conveyors;</p> <p>xiii. Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site. A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.9.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the East of West Heath Common site are as follows:</p> <p><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</u></p> <p><u>ii. i--A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</u></p> <p><u>iii. ii--A landscape and visual impact assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site (including the use of conveyors or pipeline), taking into account and seeking to minimise adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park;</u></p> <p><u>iv. iii--The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</u></p> <p><u>v. iv--Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</u></p> <p><u>vi. v--There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</u></p> <p><u>vii. vi--Proposals should ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the nearby Scheduled Monuments bridges and structures on relevant parts of the road network;</u></p> <p><u>viii. vii--At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</u></p> <p><u>ix. viii--A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking <b>to avoid</b> and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, <del>including the River Rother SNCI</del>, <b>Where necessary, changes to the development boundary will be made to prevent impacts on the water environment.</b></u></p> <p><u>x. ix--The potential for impact on the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and East Hampshire Hangers SAC should be considered, and mitigation applied to ensure no harm occurs;</u></p> <p><u>xi. x--Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</u></p> <p><u>xii. xi--A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</u></p> <p><u>xiii. xii--Consideration <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be given to ensuring mitigation measures are applied to Public Footpath 861, which is 500m west of the site, and may be impacted by the use of conveyors;</u></p> <p><u>xiv. xiii--Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site. <del>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</del></u></p> <p><u>xv. xiv--<b>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</b></u></p>
<b>MM6</b>	SSR34	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.7.</b></p> <p>The development principles for Ham Farm are as follows:</p> <p>i. A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites</p> <p>ii. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting, and Wiston Park;</p> <p>iii. The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p>iv. The access should be carefully sited to ensure lines of mature broadleaf trees remain intact. A tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with "BS5837</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.7.</b></p> <p>The development principles for Ham Farm are as follows:</p> <p><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</u></p> <p><u>ii. i--A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites</u></p> <p><u>iii. ii--A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting, and Wiston Park;</u></p>

SMM No	SSR No	JMLP Para/ Policy	Submitted SSR	Recommended Main Modification
			<p>Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction 2012” should be provided to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from site operations and that any to be removed are clearly identified and appropriate mitigation proposed;</p> <p>v. The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting;</p> <p>vi. During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the eastern and southern boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, Cherrytree Rough to the north and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p>vii. Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, should, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p>viii. There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p>ix. A historic building setting impact assessment of nearby listed buildings (including but not limited to Horsebrook Cottage and Wappingthorn Manor) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p>x. At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p>xi. A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including but not limited to, Alderwood Pond and Wiston Pond;</p> <p>xii. A flood risk assessment should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p>xiii. The transport assessment should consider the net impact of changing the land use from agricultural (maize production) to mineral and include allowances for the importation of materials for restoration and importation of feedstock for anaerobic digestion at Wappingthorn Farm;</p> <p>xiv. A HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the villages of Steyning and Storrington;</p> <p>xv. If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p>xvi. Vehicular access to the site to be created at the existing gated access and shall be designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p>xvii. There should be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p>xviii. Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be considered and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p>xix. There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p>xx. A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p>xxi. Options for restoration could include reinstating the original profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use and restoring the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, with the aim of maximising farmland habitat value, and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and lines of trees. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link the surrounding hedgerow and woodland structure; and</p> <p>xxii. A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>	<p><del>iv.</del> <del>iii.</del>–The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><del>v.</del> <del>iv.</del>–The access should be carefully sited to ensure lines of mature broadleaf trees remain intact. A tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with “BS5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction 2012” should be provided to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from site operations and that any to be removed are clearly identified and appropriate mitigation proposed;</p> <p><del>vi.</del> <del>v.</del>–The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting;</p> <p><del>vii.</del> <del>vi.</del>–During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the eastern and southern boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, Cherrytree Rough to the north and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><del>viii.</del> <del>vii.</del>–Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><del>ix.</del> <del>viii.</del>–There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><del>x.</del> <del>ix.</del>–A historic building setting impact assessment of nearby listed buildings (including but not limited to Horsebrook Cottage and Wappingthorn Manor) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xi.</del> <del>x.</del>–At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><del>xii.</del> <del>xi.</del>–A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including but not limited to, Alderwood Pond and Wiston Pond;</p> <p><del>xiii.</del> <del>xii.</del>–A flood risk assessment should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xiv.</del> <del>xiii.</del>–The transport assessment should consider the net impact of changing the land use from agricultural (maize production) to mineral and include allowances for the importation of materials for restoration and importation of feedstock for anaerobic digestion at Wappingthorn Farm;</p> <p><del>xv.</del> <del>xiv.</del>–A HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the villages of Steyning and Storrington;</p> <p><del>xvi.</del> <del>xv.</del>–If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><del>xvii.</del> <del>xvi.</del>–Vehicular access to the site to be created at the existing gated access and shall be designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><del>xviii.</del> <del>xvii.</del>–There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><del>xix.</del> <del>xviii.</del>–Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be considered and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xx.</del> <del>xix.</del>–There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><del>xxi.</del> <del>xx.</del>–A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xxii.</del> <del>xxi.</del>–Options for restoration could include reinstating the original profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use and restoring the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, with the aim of maximising farmland habitat value, and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and lines of trees. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link the surrounding hedgerow and woodland structure; and</p>



SMM No	SSR No	JMLP Para/ Policy	Submitted SSR	Recommended Main Modification
				<del>xxiii. xii.</del> –A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.
<b>MM7</b>	SSR40	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.11.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the Chantry Lane Extension are as follows:</p> <p>i. A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p>ii. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p>iii. The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p>iv. The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting, and designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p>v. During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p>vi. Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, should, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p>vii. There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p>viii. At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p>ix. A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, given its location close to the Arun Valley SPA;</p> <p>x. An HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the village of Storrington;</p> <p>xi. If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p>xii. There should be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p>xiii. Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p>xiv. There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p>xv. A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p>xvi. Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site.</p> <p>xvii. A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.11.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the Chantry Lane Extension are as follows:</p> <p><del>i.</del> <b>Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</b></p> <p><del>ii. i.</del>–A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p><del>iii. ii.</del>–A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p><del>iv. iii.</del>–The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><del>v. iv.</del>–The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting, and designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><del>vi. v.</del>–During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><del>vii. vi.</del>–Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><del>viii. vii.</del>–There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><del>ix. viii.</del>–At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><del>x. ix.</del>–A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, given its location close to the Arun Valley SPA;</p> <p><del>xi. x.</del>–An HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the village of Storrington;</p> <p><del>xii. xi.</del>–If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><del>xiii. xii.</del>–There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><del>xiv. xiii.</del>–Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xv. xiv.</del>–There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><del>xvi. xv.</del>–A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xvii. xvi.</del>–Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site.</p> <p><del>xviii. xvii.</del>–A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>

## Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for the Soft Sand Review SSR Modifications Consultation (October 2020)

Introduction .....	1
The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Process and Methodology .....	1
The SA Framework .....	2
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Subsidiary Questions.....	2
Social.....	2
Economic .....	2
Environmental .....	3
Appraisal of the Proposed Modifications .....	5
Screening and Summary Appraisals.....	5
Modifications to Policy M2 Recommendations .....	12
Modifications to Policy M1 I Recommendations.....	12
Modifications to Policy M1 I and Development Principles for each Site Allocation .....	13
Cumulative impact of sites.....	14
Next steps .....	14

## Introduction

This document assesses the Proposed Modifications to the Soft Sand Review and should be read as an Addendum to the Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal for the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan [Examination Document Library reference [SSR.CSD.002](#)].

## The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Process and Methodology

The steps taken in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the SSR up to the point of examination are set out in the Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal for the Soft Sand Review of the [Joint Minerals Local Plan](#) (2018). This document screens each of the proposed modifications in turn and then assesses the pertinent modifications against the SA Objectives, using the methodology and scoring systems set out in the original SA documentation.

*Table 1: Key to symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the JMLP (and SSR)*

Symbol	Policy Impact on the SA's Objectives
++	The policy is likely to have a significant positive impact on the SA objective(s).
+	The policy is likely to have a minor positive impact on the SA objective(s).
0	The policy is likely to have a negligible or no impact on the SA objective(s).
+/-	The policy is likely to have a mixture of positive and negative impacts on the SA objective(s).
-	The policy is likely to have a minor negative impact on the SA objective(s).
--	The policy is likely to have a significant negative impact on the SA objective(s).
?	It is uncertain what effect the policy will have on the SA objective(s).



## The SA Framework

There has been no need to update the SA Framework set out in the main SA Report. The SA Objectives are set out below for ease of reference.

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Subsidiary Questions

#### SOCIAL

- 1. To protect and, where possible, enhance health, well-being and amenity of residents, neighbouring land uses and visitors to West Sussex.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Have harmful effects on human health and be sited close to sensitive receptor(s)?
- Affect amenity through dust and noise (e.g. through blasting/traffic) or vibration?
- Affect road safety?
- Have the potential to create land use conflict issues?
- Provide opportunities for improvements to health, well-being and amenity through enhancements?
- Create cumulative effects in terms of adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential?

- 2. To protect and, where possible, enhance recreation opportunities for all, including access to and enjoyment of the countryside, open spaces and Public Rights of Way (PROW)**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Be likely to affect the amenity of users on PROW, recreation areas/open spaces or other users of the countryside in the area, or affect views and/or tranquillity of these areas?
- Provide restoration opportunities for recreation?

#### ECONOMIC

- 3. To protect, sustain, and where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Help the local economy, for example by generating new jobs, and how might implementing the policy impact on local businesses?
- Encourage the provision of more locally based skills and facilities?
- Affect tourists' decisions to visit an area?
- Compromise safe operating of commercial aerodromes (i.e. be near to an airfield and through restoration likely to attract large numbers of birds and increase the chance of bird strike)?

- 4. To conserve minerals resources from inappropriate development whilst providing for the supply of aggregates and other minerals sufficient for the needs of society.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Reduce the extraction of virgin materials?
- Avoid sterilising mineral resources by preventing unnecessary development on or near to mineral resources?

- Require prior extraction if development that would sterilise mineral resources were to go ahead?

## ENVIRONMENTAL

### 5. To protect, and where possible, enhance the landscape, local distinctiveness and landscape character in West Sussex.

Would the option/policy/site:

- Help enable the protection of landscape (particularly AONBs and SDNP) and townscape character?
- Contribute to the restoration of minerals sites, maximising after-use potential for beneficial use (e.g. agriculture, nature conservation, recreation, amenity, water storage, flood management) as appropriate?
- Facilitate the supply and use of local building materials to protect local character?
- Affect dark skies from light pollution?
- Protect and enhance the tranquillity of West Sussex including the SDNP and AONBs (e.g. by minimising noise arising from minerals facilities and transport)?
- Encourage landscape improvement?

### 6. To protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity including natural habitats and protected species.

Would the option/policy/site:

- Have an adverse effect on biodiversity, including the protection of designated sites (e.g. Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsars, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves and Ancient Woodland)?
- Have an adverse effect on locally designated sites which form part of a network of ecosystems?
- Have an adverse effect on wider habitat networks (including BAP habitats) and land used by protected species?
- Provide opportunities for enhancing biodiversity and achieving net gains as part of the development or restoration?

### 7. To protect and conserve geodiversity.

Would the option/policy/site:

- Have an adverse effect on geodiversity, including the protection of geological features or sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and Local Geological Sites, formally RIGS)?
- Create new geological exposures of education interest?
- Provide opportunities for geodiversity as part of the development or restoration?

### 8. To conserve, and where possible, enhance the historic environment.

Would the option/policy/site:

- Help enable the conservation of features of archaeological and other historic interest in the county, such as conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and areas of archaeological potential?

### 9. To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality, and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land.

Would the option/policy/site:

- Minimise the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?
- Improve the soil quality?

**10. To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Lead to a change in local air quality?
- Cause further deterioration of air quality in Air Quality Management Areas?
- Cause an increase in deposition of pollutants on sensitive designated nature conservation sites?

**11. To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Affect the quality of surface and/or groundwater bodies?
- Interfere with the flows of water bodies?

**12. To reduce vulnerability to flooding, in particular preventing inappropriate development in the floodplain.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Affect the likelihood of flooding or lead to inappropriate development in a flood risk zone (e.g. Flood Zones 2 or 3) contrary to national policy on flooding?
- Impact on flood defences?
- Provide opportunities for flood alleviation/mitigation?

**13. To minimise transport of minerals by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Lorry Route Network.**

Would the option/policy/site:

- Have the potential for rail or water-based access to and from mineral sites?
- Lead to the production of traffic-derived pollutants, including CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> due to road transport to and from minerals sites?
- Optimise the use of the Lorry Route Network and reduce the use of rural roads thus reducing the disruption and pollutants caused by HGVs?

**14. To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.**

Would the policy/option/site:

- Lead to the production of carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases from on-site vehicles and machinery?
- Reductions in transport distances by supporting the location of mineral extraction sites in proximity to surrounding markets for minerals and to serve local needs?
- Encourage the use of renewable or lower carbon energy sources on-site (e.g. through the use of small on-site renewable energy sources, i.e. wind turbines, solar panels)?

## Appraisal of the Proposed Modifications

### Screening and Summary Appraisals

The table below sets out the proposed modifications in turn and each modification is screened for further assessment. A commentary is provided for the screening assessment as well as for the appraisal scoring set out in the following section of this document.

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
SMM1	SSR3	6.2.13	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.14.</b></p> <p>The current 10 year average sales value is much higher than for sharp sand and gravel, at <del>293,737</del> 288,718 tonnes per annum (<del>2008–2017</del> <b>2009-2019</b>), and other relevant local information suggests average demand may be as high as <del>372,459</del> <b>371,869</b> tonnes per annum. Total permitted reserve of land-won soft sand in West Sussex is <del>2,754,000</del> <b>2,300,437</b> which currently provides a landbank of <del>7.4</del> <b>6.2</b> years, based on the 10 year average sales, taking account of other relevant local information. Current reserves are not sufficient to meet demand over the Plan period (up to 2033). Planning Guidance (NPPG, para 064) states that MPA's should also consider average sales over the previous three years, to identify the general trend of demand. The 3-year average of soft sand sales is <del>295,115</del> <b>315,560</b> tonnes (<del>2015–2017</del> <b>2016-2019</b>). Based on this 3-year average and current reserves, the landbank (taking account of other relevant local information) is currently <del>9.3</del> <b>7.3</b> years.</p>	Updated figures as contained in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2019 (May 2020) [SSR.OSD.005a]	This modification reflects the updated LAA and has been screened in for assessment as it refers to the level of sales and the relevant landbank for planning purposes.	Although the figures within 6.2.13 have been updated to reflect the most recent LAA, the conclusions drawn from the data have not changed and the policy direction of the SSR has not changed. The SSR will plan for soft sand in the way set out in the Submission SSR. The changes to the data show a maintained pressure to the existing landbank and the subsequent declining reserve. Therefore, there are no changes to the assessment set out within the SA of the Regulation 19 SSR.
SMM2	SSR4	6.2.14	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.15.</b></p> <p>The relevant strategic objectives are:</p> <p>1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals <b>and to ensure a steady and adequate supply</b>, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area.</p> <p>3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.</p>	To fix a typographical error and retain the Strategic Objectives as adopted in the Joint Minerals Local Plan.	This modification has been screened out of assessment as it reflects a typographical error in the original document.	N/A.
SMM3	SSR5	New para 6.2.16	<p>In order to inform the strategy for the provision of land won soft sand, the Authorities considered the opportunities for extraction:</p> <p>within West Sussex but outside of the SDNP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outside of West Sussex<sup>1</sup></li> <li>from other sources</li> <li>from within the SDNP, within West Sussex</li> <li>a combination of the options</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Footnote 1: where these opportunities are included in emerging or adopted mineral plans, or exist as sites that hold current planning permissions.</u></b></p>	For clarity in response to representations raised by Hampshire County Council.	This modification has been screened in for assessment. SSR5 was assessed in Section 5 of the SA for the SSR (2019). The additional text is supported in the SA assessment (para 5.13) that "...future reviews of the JMLP should take account of the availability of material in the wider south east...". Sites allocated in emerging or adopted minerals plans or that hold planning permissions will have been independently assessed through the planning process, including Sustainability Appraisal, for the impacts of those developments, providing additional measures of support to address the SA Objectives of the SSR.	SSR5 was assessed in Section 5 of the SA for the SSR (2019). The additional text is supported in the SA assessment (para 5.13) that "...future reviews of the JMLP should take account of the availability of material in the wider south east...". Sites allocated in emerging or adopted minerals plans or that hold planning permissions will have been independently assessed through the planning process, including Sustainability Appraisal, for the impacts of those developments, providing additional measures of support to address the SA Objectives of the SSR.
SMM4	SSR36	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.8.</b></p> <p><b>East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9):</b> Located near to Rogate, Chichester, the extension to West Heath Quarry is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 14 hectares in size and would provide 950,000 tonnes of soft sand. <b><u>The area available for extraction may be limited by the development principles set out below, including the results of the hydrogeological survey.</u></b> Materials would be exported from the extension site to the existing quarry by conveyor or</p>	<p>a) To include wording agreed with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>b) To provide additional references to West Heath Common and the River discussions at the Hearings.</p>	This modification has been screened in for assessment as it provides additional environmental criteria for these development principles.	<p>The SA of the SSR at Regulation 19 stage recommended the Development Principles for each allocation reflected the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The modifications proposed under SMM4 increase the protection of the water environment, West Heath Common and the River Rother Local</p>

06

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
			<p>pipeline, for processing, before transport by road using the existing quarry access and routing provision. Development of this site <b>should avoid and minimise any impact on West Heath Common and the River Rother Local Wildlife Site. Development should also</b> contribute to the Petersfield to Pulborough via Midhurst non-motorised route. The after use for this site would be to create a low level water environment that should maximise nature conservation and informal recreation. Any restoration scheme should be fully integrated with the restoration scheme on the existing site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>Footnote 1: SSR Landscape Assessment (2019).</p>			<p>Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The modifications are positive in terms of the SA Objectives, particularly the objectives related to water quality, landscape and biodiversity.</p>
SMM5	SSR38	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.9.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the East of West Heath Common site are as follows:</p> <p><b><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</u></b></p> <p><b><u>ii. i-</u></b>A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p><b><u>iii. ii-</u></b>A landscape and visual impact assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site (including the use of conveyors or pipeline), taking into account and seeking to minimise adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p><b><u>iv. iii-</u></b>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><b><u>v. iv-</u></b>Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><b><u>vi. v-</u></b>There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><b><u>vii. vi-</u></b>Proposals should ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the nearby Scheduled Monuments bridges and structures on relevant parts of the road network;</p> <p><b><u>viii. vii-</u></b>At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><b><u>ix. viii-</u></b>A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking <b>to avoid</b> and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, <del>including the River Rother SNCI;</del> <b><u>Where necessary, changes to the development boundary will be made to prevent impacts on the water environment.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>x. ix-</u></b>The potential for impact on the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and East Hampshire Hangers SAC should be considered, and mitigation</p>	<p>a) The development principles for the site amended to included recommendation from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>b) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>c) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles iv, vii and xii.</p> <p>d) To amend a drafting error and add the requirement for a site liaison group as a separate development principle.</p>	<p>This modification has been screened in for assessment as it provides additional environmental criteria for these development principles.</p>	<p>The SA of the SSR at Regulation 19 stage recommended the Development Principles for each allocation reflected the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The modifications proposed under SMM5 require more specific protection of the local environment and include a requirement for net gains in biodiversity.</p> <p>The modifications are positive in terms of the SA Objectives, particularly the objectives related to water quality, landscape, natural environment and amenity.</p>

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
			<p>applied to ensure no harm occurs;</p> <p><del>xii.</del> <del>xi.</del> Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xiii.</del> <del>xi.</del> A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xiv.</del> <del>xii.</del> Consideration <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be given to ensuring mitigation measures are applied to Public Footpath 861, which is 500m west of the site, and may be impacted by the use of conveyors;</p> <p><del>xv.</del> <del>xiii.</del> Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site. <del>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</del></p> <p><del>xvi.</del> <del>xiv.</del> <b>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</b></p>			
SMM6	SSR34	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.7.</b></p> <p>The development principles for Ham Farm are as follows:</p> <p><b><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</u></b></p> <p><del>ii.</del> <del>i.</del> A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites</p> <p><del>iii.</del> <del>ii.</del> A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting, and Wiston Park;</p> <p><del>iv.</del> <del>iii.</del> The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><del>v.</del> <del>iv.</del> The access should be carefully sited to ensure lines of mature broadleaf trees remain intact. A tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with “BS5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction 2012” should be provided to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from site operations and that any to be removed are clearly identified and appropriate mitigation proposed;</p> <p><del>vi.</del> <del>v.</del> The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting;</p> <p><del>vii.</del> <del>vi.</del> During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the eastern and southern boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, Cherrytree Rough to the north and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to</p>	<p>a) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>b) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles vii, xi and xvii.</p>	<p>This modification has been screened in for assessment as it provides additional environmental criteria for these development principles.</p>	<p>The SA of the SSR at Regulation 19 stage recommended the Development Principles for each allocation reflected the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The modifications proposed under SMM6 require more specific protection of the local environment and include a requirement for net gains in biodiversity.</p> <p>The modifications are positive in terms of the SA Objectives, particularly the objectives related to water quality, landscape, natural environment and amenity.</p>



SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
			<p>minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><del>viii.</del> vii.-Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><del>ix.</del> viii.-There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><del>x.</del> ix.-A historic building setting impact assessment of nearby listed buildings (including but not limited to Horsebrook Cottage and Wappingthorn Manor) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xi.</del> x.-At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><del>xii.</del> xi.-A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including but not limited to, Alderwood Pond and Wiston Pond;</p> <p><del>xiii.</del> xii.-A flood risk assessment should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xiv.</del> xiii.-The transport assessment should consider the net impact of changing the land use from agricultural (maize production) to mineral and include allowances for the importation of materials for restoration and importation of feedstock for anaerobic digestion at Wappingthorn Farm;</p> <p><del>xv.</del> xiv.-A HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the villages of Steyning and Storrington;</p> <p><del>xvi.</del> xv.-If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><del>xvii.</del> xvi.-Vehicular access to the site to be created at the existing gated access and shall be designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><del>xviii.</del> xvii.-There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><del>xix.</del> xviii.-Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be considered and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xx.</del> xix.-There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><del>xxi.</del> xx.-A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xxii.</del> xxi.-Options for restoration could include reinstating the original</p>			



SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
			<p>profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use and restoring the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, with the aim of maximising farmland habitat value, and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and lines of trees. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link the surrounding hedgerow and woodland structure; and</p> <p><del>xxiii.</del> <del>xii.</del> A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>			
SMM7	SSR40	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.11.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the Chantry Lane Extension are as follows:</p> <p><del>i.</del> <u>Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;</u></p> <p><del>ii.</del> <del>i.</del> A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p><del>iii.</del> <del>ii.</del> A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p><del>iv.</del> <del>iii.</del> The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><del>v.</del> <del>iv.</del> The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting, and designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><del>vi.</del> <del>v.</del> During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><del>vii.</del> <del>vi.</del> Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><del>viii.</del> <del>vii.</del> There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><del>ix.</del> <del>viii.</del> At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><del>x.</del> <del>ix.</del> A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground</p>	<p>a) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>b) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles vi, ix and xii.</p>	<p>This modification has been screened in for assessment as it provides additional environmental criteria for these development principles.</p>	<p>The SA of the SSR at Regulation 19 stage recommended the Development Principles for each allocation reflected the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The modifications proposed under SMM7 require more specific protection of the local environment, including a requirement for net gains in biodiversity and a further assessment of cumulative impact at the time an application comes forward.</p> <p>The modifications are positive in terms of the SA Objectives, particularly the objectives related to water quality, landscape, natural environment and amenity.</p>

46

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	SA Screening	SA Assessment Commentary
			<p>water and watercourses, given its location close to the Arun Valley SPA;</p> <p><del>xii.</del> <del>x.</del> An HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the village of Storrington;</p> <p><del>xiii.</del> <del>xi.</del> If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><del>xiii.</del> <del>xii.</del> There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><del>xiv.</del> <del>xiii.</del> Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xv.</del> <del>xiv.</del> There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><del>xvi.</del> <del>xv.</del> A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xvii.</del> <del>xvi.</del> Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site.</p> <p><del>xviii.</del> <del>xvii.</del> A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>			

Modifications to Policy M2 Recommendations

The table below sets out an updated assessment for Policy M2 as revised by proposed modification SMM2.

SA of Submission M2	Modifications in SMM2
<p>The SA assessments indicate that the most sustainable strategy is likely to be a combination of the options that allows for all potential sites and sources to come forward, where they are available, over the plan period. The SA recommends that Policy M2 clearly sets out a hierarchy of decision making, ensuring that sites only come forward in relation to the need at the time of the application and applicants are signposted to the NPPF requirement to seek sites outside of designated landscapes in the first instance.</p> <p>Policy M2 should be clear that sites allocated in Policy M1 I have precedence over windfall sites and that sites should be well located to the Lorry Route Network if other modes of transport is not viable. The JMLP contains a number of DM policies which can control and ensure mitigation of any impacts from development and the policy should clearly reference this, or provide further information in the supporting text. As the strategy allows for allocations in the SDNP, M2 should be clear that any application will be considered in the context of major development and applications outside of the SDNP also must assess the potential impact they would have.</p>	<p>The modification proposed increases the certainty that sites referred to in criterion (b) in any provision from outside of the Plan Area will have been subject to assessment through a development plan process or the planning application process. The modification is seen as positive in terms of the SA Objectives for the SSR.</p>

Modifications to Policy M1 I Recommendations

The table below sets out an updated assessment for Policy M1 I as revised by proposed modification SMM4, SMM5, SMM6 and SMM7.

SA of Submission M1 I	SA of Modifications in SMM4, SMM5, SMM6 and SMM7
<p>As stated above, the SA assessments indicate that the most sustainable strategy is likely to be a combination of the options that allows for all potential sites and sources to come forward, where they are available, over the plan period. Policy M2 incorporates a hierarchy of decision making and the SA recommendations set out above.</p> <p>The requirements for M1 I are assessed in this context. Policy M1 I should be clear that sites will be assessed in the context of the all policies within the JMLP, and other relevant policies in the development plan. The adopted policy includes a series of ‘Development Principles’ for the allocation at West Hoathly Brickworks. It is recommended that these are included of all soft sand allocations and that these follow the outcomes of the technical assessments and the HRA.</p>	<p>The SA of the SSR at Regulation 19 stage recommended the Development Principles for each allocation reflected the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The modifications proposed under SMM4 to SMM7 require more specific protection of the local environment, including a requirement for net gains in biodiversity and a further assessment of cumulative impact at the time an application comes forward.</p> <p>The modifications are positive in terms of the SA Objectives, particularly the objectives related to water quality, landscape, natural environment and amenity.</p>

86  
**Modifications to Policy M11 and Development Principles for each Site Allocation**

The table below sets out an updated assessment for each Site Allocation as revised by proposed modification SMM4, SMM5, SMM6 and SMM7. Refer to Table 1 on page 1 for the key to symbols and colour coding used.

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Chantry Lane</b>	<b>SMM7</b>	<b>East of West Heath</b>	<b>SMM4 and SMM5</b>	<b>Ham Farm</b>	<b>SMM6</b>
1. To protect and, where possible, enhance health, well-being and amenity of residents, neighbouring land uses and visitors to West Sussex.	0/-?	0/-?	0/-?	0/-?	0/-?	0/-?
2. To protect and, where possible, enhance recreation opportunities for all, including access to the countryside, open spaces and Public Rights of Way (PROW).	0	0	+?	+?	-?	-?
3. To protect, sustain, and where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy.	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. To conserve minerals resources from inappropriate development whilst providing for the supply of aggregates and other minerals sufficient for the needs of society.	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. To protect, and where possible, enhance the landscape, local distinctiveness and landscape character in West Sussex.	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. To protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity including natural habitats and protected species.	-?	+?	-?	+?	-?	+?
7. To protect and conserve geodiversity.	-?	-?	0	0	0	0
8. To conserve, and where possible, enhance the historic environment.	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?
9. To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality, and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land.	0	0	0	0	--	--
10. To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?
11. To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment.	?	+?	?	+?	?	+?
12. To reduce vulnerability to flooding, in particular preventing inappropriate development in the floodplain.	0?	+?	-?	+?	0?	+?
13. To minimise transport of minerals by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Lorry Route Network.	--	--	0	0	-	-
14. To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?

### Cumulative impact of sites

The sites put forward within the Submission SSR have not changed through the Modifications and are:

- Ham Farm
- East of West Heath
- Chantry Lane Extension

Two sites are in reasonable proximity (Ham Farm, Chantry Lane Extension) and one site is some distance away. Modifications SMM4 to SMM7 are supported by the SA for the Submission SSR which stated that the potential for cumulative impacts needs to consider existing minerals development as well as the impact of the combination of sites proposed. The modifications increase the robustness of the development principles in relation to the SA Objectives.

### Next steps

This SA Addendum will be available for consultation alongside the SSR Modifications Consultation between November 2020 and January 2021.

Following this stage any comments on the SA will be submitted to the appointed Planning Inspector, along with the representations related to the Modifications. The SA and any comments will then be considered by the planning inspector who will review the representations and issue his report. If the SSR, as modified, is considered sound, it will be adopted, and the Authorities will prepare and publish an Adoption Statement.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment for the Soft Sand Review Proposed Modifications to the SSR (October 2020)

This document should be read in conjunction with the Regulation 19 Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) of the Soft Sand Review, September 2019 [Examination Document Library reference [SSR.OSD.008](#)]. The table below considers the proposed modifications to the Soft Sand Review in turn against the test for Likely Significant Effects. The outcome of the consideration against the test for Likely Significant Effects is that none of the modifications proposed alter the conclusions of the original HRA document.

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	Likely Significant Effects Test
SMM1	SSR3	6.2.13	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.14.</b></p> <p>The current 10 year average sales value is much higher than for sharp sand and gravel, at <del>293,737</del> 288,718 tonnes per annum (<del>2008–2017</del> <b>2009-2019</b>), and other relevant local information suggests average demand may be as high as <del>372,459</del> <b>371,869</b> tonnes per annum. Total permitted reserve of land-won soft sand in West Sussex is <del>2,754,000</del> <b>2,300,437</b> which currently provides a landbank of <del>7.4</del> <b>6.2</b> years, based on the 10 year average sales, taking account of other relevant local information. Current reserves are not sufficient to meet demand over the Plan period (up to 2033). Planning Guidance (NPPG, para 064) states that MPA's should also consider average sales over the previous three years, to identify the general trend of demand. The 3-year average of soft sand sales is <del>295,115</del> <b>315,560</b> tonnes (<del>2015–2017</del> <b>2016-2019</b>). Based on this 3-year average and current reserves, the landbank (taking account of other relevant local information) is currently <del>9.3</del> <b>7.3</b> years.</p>	Updated figures as contained in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2019 (May 2020) [SSR.OSD.005a]	This modification sets out amendments as per the latest LAA figures. The nature of these changes are such that <b>this modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b>
SMM2	SSR4	6.2.14	<p><b>New paragraph number: 6.2.15.</b></p> <p>The relevant strategic objectives are:</p> <p>1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals <u>and to ensure a steady and adequate supply</u>, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area.</p> <p>3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.</p>	To fix a typographical error and retain the Strategic Objectives as adopted in the Joint Minerals Local Plan.	This modification is correcting a typographical error for consistency with the adopted JMLP. The nature of this change is such that <b>this modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b>
SMM3	SSR5	New para 6.2.16	<p>In order to inform the strategy for the provision of land won soft sand, the Authorities considered the opportunities for extraction:</p> <p>within West Sussex but outside of the SDNP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outside of West Sussex<sup>1</sup></li> <li>from other sources</li> <li>from within the SDNP, within West Sussex</li> <li>a combination of the options</li> </ul> <p><u>Footnote 1: where these opportunities are included in emerging or adopted mineral plans, or exist as sites that hold current planning permissions.</u></p>	For clarity in response to representations raised by Hampshire County Council.	This modification is a matter of contextual clarification. <b>This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b>
SMM4	SSR36	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.8.</b></p> <p><b>East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9):</b> Located near to Rogate, Chichester, the extension to West Heath Quarry is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 14 hectares in size and would provide 950,000 tonnes of soft sand. <u>The area available for extraction may be limited by the development principles set out below, including the results of the hydrogeological survey.</u> Materials would be exported from the extension site to the existing quarry by conveyor or pipeline, for processing, before transport by road using the existing quarry access and routing provision. Development of this site <u>should avoid and minimise any impact on West Heath Common and the River Rother Local Wildlife Site.</u> Development should also contribute to the Petersfield to Pulborough via Midhurst non-motorised route. The after use for this site would be to create a low level water environment that should maximise nature conservation and informal recreation. Any restoration scheme should be fully integrated with the restoration scheme on the existing site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>Footnote 1: SSR Landscape Assessment (2019).</p>	<p>a) To include wording agreed with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>b) To provide additional references to West Heath Common and the River discussions at the Hearings.</p>	These additions are positive with regards to ecology, and provide clarification and strengthening to the criteria. <b>This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b>

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	Likely Significant Effects Test
SMM5	SSR38	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.9.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the East of West Heath Common site are as follows:</p> <p><u><b>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity:</b></u></p> <p><del>ii. i-</del>A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p><del>iii. ii-</del>A landscape and visual impact assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site (including the use of conveyors or pipeline), taking into account and seeking to minimise adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p><del>iv. iii-</del>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><del>v. iv-</del>Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><del>vi. v-</del>There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><del>vii. vi-</del>Proposals should ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the nearby Scheduled Monuments bridges and structures on relevant parts of the road network;</p> <p><del>viii. vii-</del>At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><del>ix. viii-</del>A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking <u><b>to avoid</b></u> and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, <del>including the River Rother SNCI</del>. <u><b>Where necessary, changes to the development boundary will be made to prevent impacts on the water environment.</b></u></p> <p><del>x. ix-</del>The potential for impact on the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and East Hampshire Hangers SAC should be considered, and mitigation applied to ensure no harm occurs;</p> <p><del>xi. x-</del>Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><del>xii. xi-</del>A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><del>xiii. xii-</del>Consideration <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be given to ensuring mitigation measures are applied to Public Footpath 861, which is 500m west of the site, and may be impacted by the use of conveyors;</p> <p><del>xiv. xiii-</del>Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site. <del>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</del></p> <p><del>xv. xiv-</del><u><b>A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</b></u></p>	<p>a) The development principles for the site amended to included recommendation from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>b) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>c) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles iv, vii and xii.</p> <p>d) To amend a drafting error and add the requirement for a site liaison group as a separate development principle.</p>	<p>These additions are positive with regards to ecology, and provide clarification and strengthening to the criteria. <b>This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b></p>



SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	Likely Significant Effects Test
SMM6	SSR34	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.7.</b></p> <p>The development principles for Ham Farm are as follows:</p> <p><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity:</u></p> <p><u>ii. i</u>—A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites</p> <p><u>iii. ii</u>—A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting, and Wiston Park;</p> <p><u>iv. iii</u>—The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><u>v. iv</u>—The access should be carefully sited to ensure lines of mature broadleaf trees remain intact. A tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with “BS5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction 2012” should be provided to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from site operations and that any to be removed are clearly identified and appropriate mitigation proposed;</p> <p><u>vi. v</u>—The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting;</p> <p><u>vii. vi</u>—During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the eastern and southern boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, Cherrytree Rough to the north and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><u>viii. vii</u>—Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><u>ix. viii</u>—There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><u>x. ix</u>—A historic building setting impact assessment of nearby listed buildings (including but not limited to Horsebrook Cottage and Wappingthorn Manor) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><u>xi. x</u>—At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><u>xii. xi</u>—A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including but not limited to, Alderwood Pond and Wiston Pond;</p> <p><u>xiii. xii</u>—A flood risk assessment should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><u>xiv. xiii</u>—The transport assessment should consider the net impact of changing the land use from agricultural (maize production) to mineral and include allowances for the importation of materials for restoration and importation of feedstock for anaerobic digestion at Wappingthorn Farm;</p> <p><u>xv. xiv</u>—A HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the villages of Steyning and Storrington;</p> <p><u>xvi. xv</u>—If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><u>xvii. xvi</u>—Vehicular access to the site to be created at the existing gated access and shall be designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><u>xviii. xvii</u>—There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><u>xix. xviii</u>—Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be considered and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><u>xx. xix</u>—There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><u>xxi. xx</u>—A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><u>xxii. xxi</u>—Options for restoration could include reinstating the original profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use and restoring the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, with the aim of maximising farmland habitat value, and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and lines of trees. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link the surrounding hedgerow and woodland structure; and</p> <p><u>xxiii. xxii</u>—A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>	<p>a) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>b) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles vii, xi and xvii.</p>	<p>These additions are positive with regards to ecology, and provide clarification and strengthening to the criteria. <b>This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b></p>

102

SMM Ref	SSR Ref	JMLP Para/Policy	Proposed Modification	Reason for Proposed Modification	Likely Significant Effects Test
SMM7	SSR40	-	<p><b>New paragraph number: 7.2.11.</b></p> <p>The development principles for the Chantry Lane Extension are as follows:</p> <p><u>i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity:</u></p> <p><u>ii. i</u>—A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;</p> <p><u>iii. ii</u>—A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park;</p> <p><u>iv. iii</u>—The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;</p> <p><u>v. iv</u>—The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting, and designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;</p> <p><u>vi. v</u>—During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;</p> <p><u>vii. vi</u>—Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, <del>should</del> <b>must</b>, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;</p> <p><u>viii. vii</u>—There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;</p> <p><u>ix. viii</u>—At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;</p> <p><u>x. ix</u>—A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to <b>avoid and</b> minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, given its location close to the Arun Valley SPA;</p> <p><u>xi. x</u>—An HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the village of Storrington;</p> <p><u>xii. xi</u>—If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;</p> <p><u>xiii. xii</u>—There <del>should</del> <b>must</b> be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;</p> <p><u>xiv. xiii</u>—Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;</p> <p><u>xv. xiv</u>—There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;</p> <p><u>xvi. xv</u>—A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;</p> <p><u>xvii. xvi</u>—Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site.</p> <p><u>xviii. xvii</u>—A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.</p>	<p>a) To insert a new development principle to require net gain in biodiversity for consistency with national policy.</p> <p>b) To strengthen wording in relation to submitted development principles vi, ix and xii.</p>	<p>These additions are positive with regards to ecology, and provide clarification and strengthening to the criteria. <b>This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Submitted HRA.</b></p>

Next steps

This HRA Addendum will be available for consultation alongside the SSR Modifications Consultation between November 2020 and January 2021.

Following this stage any comments on the HRA will be submitted to the appointed Planning Inspector, along with the representations related to the Modifications. The HRA and any comments will then be considered by the planning inspector who will review the representations and issue his report. If the SSR, as modified, is considered sound, it will be adopted, and the Authorities will prepare and publish an Adoption Statement.

## Revised Policy M2 and supporting text

### Soft Sand

- 6.2.13. Land won soft sand is of a particular quality that cannot be substituted by other minerals. The soft sand resource is heavily constrained due its location within or adjacent to the South Downs National Park.
- 6.2.14. The current 10 year average sales value is much higher than for sharp sand and gravel, at 288,718 tonnes per annum (2009 – 2018), and other relevant local information suggests average demand may be as high as 371,869 tonnes per annum. ~~soft sand is 313,210 tonnes (2007 – 2016) (based on January 2017 data), which is higher than for sharp sand and gravel. In 2017, t~~ The total permitted reserve of land-won soft sand in West Sussex is 2,300,437 ~~3,354,800~~ tonnes which currently provides a landbank of 10.7 ~~6.2~~ years<sup>1</sup>, based on the 10 year average sales, taking account of other relevant local information. ~~The supply and demand picture shows that additional supplies of 2.36mt of soft sand are likely to be needed towards the latter half of the Plan period. Current reserves are not sufficient to meet demand over the Plan period (up to 2033). Planning Guidance (NPPG, para 064) states that MPAs should also consider average sales over the previous three years, to identify the general trend of demand. The 3-year average of soft sand sales is 315,560 tonnes (2016-2018). Based on this 3-year average and current reserves, the landbank (taking account of other relevant local information) is currently 7.3 years.~~
- 6.2.15. The relevant strategic objectives are;
- *1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals and to ensure a steady and adequate supply, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area.*
  - *3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the identified need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.*
- 6.2.16. In order to inform the **strategy** for the provision of land won soft sand, the Authorities considered the opportunities for extraction:

#### 7.1.1.

<sup>1</sup> This does not take account of other relevant local information concerning future levels of house building and road construction as set out in the Local Aggregates Assessment.

- within West Sussex but outside the SDNP
  - outside of West Sussex<sup>2</sup>
  - from other sources
  - from within the SDNP, within West Sussex
  - a combination of the options
- 6.2.17. The Authorities have engaged in discussions under Duty to Cooperate with all Mineral Planning Authorities across the South East culminating in the agreement of a joint Position Statement for Soft Sand. Further Statements of Common Ground have been prepared on the issue of soft sand provision, as necessary, and the Authorities will continue to engage with other MPAs on the issue given to constrained nature of soft sand in West Sussex.
- 6.2.18. In light of this work, site allocations through Policy M11 make provision for soft sand to meet the shortfalls set out in the latest LAA.
- 6.2.19. The **strategy** for the provision of land won soft sand is:
- to allocate a new site inside of West Sussex and outside of the South Downs National Park (see Policy M11)
  - to allocate two extensions to existing soft sand sites within the South Downs National Park (see Policy M11)
  - to continue to work with Mineral Planning Authorities across the South East to identify potential alternative sources of soft sand (land won, marine won or substitute materials) to ensure that sites provision is made for soft sand outside of protected landscapes in the first instance.
- 6.2.20. This strategy accords with national policy as it seeks to make provision for non-energy minerals from outside of protected areas in the first instance NPPF para 205(a). In future, provision for soft sand may be available from beyond West Sussex and from alternative sources. This information will form part of the assessment of any planning application that comes forward on allocated or unallocated sites.
- 6.2.21. Any application for soft sand extraction within the SDNP, that is determined to be major development, will be assessed to determine whether or not exceptional circumstances exist and whether a proposal would be in the public interest.

#### 7.1.1.1.

<sup>2</sup> Where these opportunities are included in emerging or adopted mineral plans, or exist at sites that hold current planning permissions.

- 6.2.22. Policy M2 will be used to determine all planning applications for soft sand extraction in West Sussex, including extensions of time and physical extensions on allocated and unallocated sites.

~~Any proposals for land won soft sand extraction submitted before the adoption of the single issue soft sand review of the Plan, will be considered on its merits and against Policy M2 and other policies in this Plan~~

### **Policy M2: Soft Sand**

(a) Proposals for land won soft sand extraction, including extensions of time and physical extensions to existing sites, will be permitted provided that:

- i. The proposal is needed to ensure a steady and adequate supply of soft sand and to maintain at least a seven year land bank, as set out in the most recent Local Aggregates Assessment; and
- ii. The site is allocated within Policy M11 of this Plan, or if the proposal is on an unallocated site, it can be demonstrated that the need cannot be met through the site/s allocated for that purpose; and
- iii. Where transportation by rail or water is not practicable or viable, the proposal is well-related to the Lorry Route Network.

(b) Proposals located outside the South Downs National Park that accord with part (a) must not adversely impact on its setting.

(c) Proposals located within the South Downs National Park that accord with part (a) and constitute major development will be refused other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest.

~~Proposals for land won soft sand extraction, including extensions of time and physical extensions to existing sites, will be permitted providing that the proposal is needed to meet the shortfall of soft sand of 2.36 million tonnes (or as calculated in the most recent Local Aggregates Assessment) over the Plan period and maintain at least a seven year landbank.~~

~~The Authorities will commence a single issue soft sand review of this Plan within 6 months of the adoption of this Plan. The Plan Review will be submitted for examination within two years from the commencement of the review and address the shortfall of soft sand at that time (as calculated in the most recent Local Aggregates Assessment). In the event that the reviewed Plan is not submitted within two years then the Plan, in terms of soft sand, will be deemed to be out of date.~~

- 6.2.23. The Authorities' Monitoring Report will be updated annually to contain the latest information about the status of the allocated sites. The landbank calculation for the purposes of Policy M2(a(i)) will be made by using the reserve and annual demand information set out in the most recent published Local Aggregate Assessment.
- 6.2.24. Site allocations are set out in policy M11. The [Soft Sand Site Selection Report](#), [Sustainability Appraisal](#) and [Major Development Background Paper](#) set out how the Authorities undertook the site selection process. For development proposals on unallocated sites a clear preference will be given to sites with the least impact on the SDNP in line with national policy.
- 6.2.25. Sites outside of the boundary of the SDNP will be assessed for their impact on the setting of the SDNP in line with Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 which requires all relevant authorities, including statutory undertakers and other public bodies, to have regard to the purposes of a National Park.
- 6.2.26. Sites within the South Downs National Park that are assessed as constituting major development will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances exist and the development would be in the public interest before planning permission is granted.<sup>3</sup>
- 6.2.27. Physical extensions to existing sites generally benefit from established infrastructure (e.g. access roads, processing plant and offices) which means that it may be more appropriate to continue activities, rather than develop new sites. The acceptability of extending existing sites will also depend on the cumulative impacts of continued working, considered in more detail by Policy M22.
- 6.2.28. Proposals to extend existing sites will only be supported where the existing site does not have any outstanding or unresolved issues in relation to planning controls aimed at ensuring that the site operates without harm. For example, if a site that should have been partly restored in accordance with a phased restoration scheme were to be extended, this would exacerbate the ongoing impact on the landscape.
- ~~6.2.29. The shortfall of supply, as calculated at the time when the planning application is determined, will be a material consideration. The landbank calculation for the purposes of Policy M2 will be made by using the~~

#### 7.1.1. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>3</sup> [West Sussex and South Downs Major Development Topic Paper](#)

~~reserve and annual demand information set out in the latest Local Aggregate Assessment.~~

~~6.2.30. The single issue review of the Plan required under Policy M2 will address the strategy to maintain a steady and adequate supply of soft sand, the supply and demand for soft sand, and the approach to meet any shortfall, including the potential need to allocate sites. Although the Plan Review will address these matters, it will not change the end date of this Plan.~~

~~6.2.31. Policy M2 sets out the timeframe for the commencement and submission of the Plan Review. 'Commencement' is defined as being publication of an invitation to make representations in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. If the Plan Review is not submitted within two years from commencement, the soft sand parts of this Plan will be deemed to be out of date.~~

<b>Implementation and Monitoring</b>	
<i>Actions</i>	<i>Key Organisation(s)</i>
Annual monitoring of sand and gravel sales data from operators. Annual production of Assessment of Need for Aggregates (Local Aggregate Assessment)	WSCC, SDNPA, minerals operators, South East England Aggregates Working Party.
<i>Measure/Indicator</i>	<i>Trend/Target</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Soft sand sales</li> <li>- Permitted soft sand reserves</li> </ul>	<p>Trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Soft sand continues to be adequately supplied to the construction industry in West Sussex.</del></li> <li><del>100% of decisions made on planning applications for soft sand extraction are consistent with Policy M2.</del></li> <li>- Declining landbank within the South Downs National Park</li> <li>- Soft sand continues to be adequately supplied to the construction industry in West Sussex</li> </ul>
<i>Intervention Levels</i>	<i>Actions</i>



<p><del>New soft sand reserve permitted within the South Downs National Park (contrary to approach of managed retreat)</del></p> <p>Lack of sites coming forward that are able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with the Aggregates Working Party to monitor supplies of soft sand in the south east</li> <li>- Review policy</li> </ul>
---	--



## Revised Policy M11 and supporting text

# 7. Strategic Minerals Site Allocations

## 7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. This chapter identifies the mineral sites that ~~has~~ **have** been allocated in the Plan in pursuit of the following **strategic objectives**: *1: To promote the prudent and efficient production and use of minerals and to ensure a steady and adequate supply, having regard to the market demand and constraints on supply in the Plan area. 3: To make provision for soft sand, silica sand and sharp sand and gravel, to meet the need, from outside the South Downs National Park, where possible; and only allow development within the national park in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.*
- 7.1.2. Paragraph ~~204~~ ~~143~~ of the NPPF requires that Local Plans should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land. Specifically in relation to planning for aggregate minerals, paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that Mineral Planning Authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply by, amongst other things, identifying specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria as appropriate.
- 7.1.3. Allocation of a site gives certainty to the mineral industry and local communities about the acceptability 'in principle' of the use of an identified site for mineral extraction. However, all planning applications must be judged on their merits and the allocation of a site in the Plan does not mean that a proposal for the allocated use will automatically be granted planning permission; the proposal must be acceptable in its own right taking into account all the material considerations. This includes the application to the proposed development of the relevant use-specific and general development management and policies of this Plan. It should also be noted that wider (non-land use planning) controls may apply to development proposals, for example, the environmental permitting regime.
- 7.1.4. Development within the SDNP will need to consider its impact on the purposes of the SDNP<sup>4</sup> at each stage of development. Restoration of sites within or nearby to the SDNP should consider their ability to contribute to ecosystem services and biodiversity net-gain. The SDNPA will prepare a

### 7.1.1.

<sup>4</sup> As set out in the National Parks and Access to Countryside Act 1949, as amended by the Environment Act 1995.

guide to restoration of mineral sites within the SDNP and proposals should take account of this in the preparation of any planning application.

- 7.1.5. Although the allocated sites are currently available for mineral uses during the Plan period, circumstances may change and they may not come forward as expected. Private sector businesses (and, therefore, commercial considerations) will determine whether extraction will actually take place. Therefore, the Plan potentially allows, under the use-specific policies in the preceding chapter, for other sites to come forward for mineral extraction. Such provision will provide additional flexibility and compensate for any allocated sites that do not come forward for minerals extraction. Accordingly, the fact that a site is not allocated in the Plan does not mean that a proposal for mineral extraction at that site will not receive planning permission at some future date.
- 7.1.6. Following technical work and discussions with the mineral industry, statutory and other consultees, and resident and community groups, a number of guiding principals have been identified for the location of new mineral extraction sites. These sites are needed to address likely demand shortfalls for meeting needs for soft sand in West Sussex as identified in Chapter 6.
- 7.1.7. There are ~~five~~ six key guiding principles that have been used to guide the identification of the allocated sites:
- **First principle:** *Places where there are opportunities to restore land beneficially, for example a net-gain in biodiversity.*
  - **Second principle:** *Places without a sensitive natural or built environment and away from communities, in order to protect the amenity of businesses, residents and visitors to West Sussex*
  - **Third principle:** *the new sites should have good access to the Lorry Route Network (LRN). Access from the site to the LRN should be acceptable 'in principle', that is, there should not be any technical issues, with regard to highway capacity and road safety, that cannot be overcome.*
  - **Fourth principle:** *The need to protect and enhance, where possible, protected landscapes in the plan area, particularly ensuring that any major minerals development will only be considered within designated landscapes in exceptional circumstances and in the public interest.*
  - **Fifth principle:** *A preference for extensions to existing sites rather than new sites, subject to cumulative impact assessments.*

- **~~Fifth~~ Sixth principle:** *The need to avoid the needless sterilisation of minerals by other forms of development*

## 7.2. Strategic Mineral Site Allocation

- 7.2.1. A detailed technical assessment of the site has been undertaken that has not identified any overriding or fundamental constraints to the proposed forms of development on the allocated sites. This includes, for example, the potential impact of the development on amenity and character, and risk to the natural and historic environment. It is considered, therefore, that any potential unacceptable impacts can be prevented, minimised, mitigated, or compensated for to an acceptable standard. Restoration forms a key part of any application for mineral extraction and proposals should ensure appropriate mitigation through the extraction period as well as the proposals for the final land use. Pre-application advice should be sought to ensure each site is brought forward in the most appropriate way, as set out in Policy M24 Restoration and Aftercare. Accordingly, the site allocated in Policy M11 is acceptable 'in principle' for the allocated use/s.
- 7.2.2. Proposals for development on the allocations within the SDNP that are considered to be major development will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances exist and the development would be in the public interest before planning permission is granted in line with policy M2.

### Policy M11: Strategic Minerals Site Allocations

**(a) The following site is allocated for the extraction of clay for brick making and is acceptable, in principle, for that purpose:**

- **Extension to West Hoathly Brickworks (Policies Map 1)**

**(b) The following sites are allocated for soft sand extraction and are acceptable, in principle, for that purpose:**

- **Ham Farm, Steyning (Policies Map 8)**
- **East of West Heath Common (Extension) (Policies Map 9)**
- **Chantry Lane Extension (Policies Map 10)**

**(b) The development of the allocated sites must take place in accordance with the policies of this Plan and satisfactorily address the 'development principles' for that site identified in the supporting text to this policy.**

**(ed) The allocated site will be safeguarded from any development either on or adjoining the sites that would prevent or prejudice the development of its allocated minerals use or uses.**

<b>Implementation and Monitoring</b>	
<i>Actions/Activities</i>	<i>Key Organisation(s)</i>
Development management process	WSCC, minerals industry
Monitoring the 'take-up' of allocated sites through the AMR	n/a
<i>Measure/Indicator</i>	<i>Trend/Target</i>
Number of applications for minerals working on allocated sites permitted per annum.	n/a
Type of facilities permitted on allocated sites per annum	In line with the requirements of the Plan area as set out in Policy M11
<i>Intervention Levels</i>	A downward trend in applications on allocated sites (compared with applications on unallocated sites). Loss of allocations to non-minerals uses or use for minerals determined as being undeliverable.

7.2.3. The broad locations of the sites allocated in Policy M11 is shown on the Policies Maps 1. The boundary of each the allocated site is identified on the Policies Maps 1. The following paragraphs identify 'development principles' for the sites, that is, specific issues that will need to be addressed at the planning application stage, as and when proposals come forward for the allocated sites. Policy M11 requires these principles to be satisfactorily addressed in addition to any requirements within the use-specific and general development management policies of this Plan. Application of the Development Principles should take place alongside full consideration of the Development Management policies set out in Chapter 8.

7.2.4. ***Extension to West Hoathly Brickworks, West Hoathly (Policies map 1)***: Located in West Hoathly, Mid Sussex, the site is used for agricultural purposes and is approximately 9 hectares in size. The site would provide a 2-3 year supply of Wadhurst clay to the existing brick factory. The after use for this site would be a return to agricultural uses, or restoring part, or all, of the land to woodland. Restoration should seek to reinstate the original profile of the site.

7.2.5. The development principles for the Extension to West Hoathly Brickworks are as follows:

- (i) Phasing of clay extraction and restoration so that a series of small areas are developed in sequence, to reduce visual intrusion;
- (ii) careful siting of extraction and infrastructure on the lower areas to the northwest of the site to reduce visual intrusion on the village and Historic Park and Garden to the south;
- (iii) perimeter mounding (using topsoil and overburden) and then planting of native trees and shrubs along the southern and eastern boundary, including some evergreen species, to screen/filter views of the village to the southeast, and Top Road to the south;
- (iv) perimeter mounding should be carried out and then planting of native trees and shrubs along the north western boundary, to reduce visibility from views along the valley and the hills to the northwest within the wider AONB;
- (v) in order to minimise negative impacts on mature trees and watercourses, appropriate buffers, where no development shall take place, should be created and retained along the watercourse, and around the mature trees and ancient woodland within and adjacent to the site around these features;
- (vi) in areas where no excavation is to occur, existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation should be protected and linked by new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas and reducing overall visibility across the site from surrounding areas;

- (vii) an assessment of the impact on the Ancient Woodland (Blackland Wood, Front Wood and Cookhams Shaw); should be carried out , appropriate buffers incorporated, and mitigation provided, if required in accordance with Natural England and the Forestry Commission's standing advice;
- (viii) an assessment of the impact on the Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC, and Wakehurst & Chiddingly Woods SSSI and Weir Wood Reservoir SSSI should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;
- (ix) an assessment of the impact on nearby listed buildings (including Aldern House, Old Coombe House and Blackland Farmhouse) and the Historic Parkscapes (Courtlands and Northwood House) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;
- (x) at pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;
- (xi) a flood risk assessment should be carried out, and mitigation provided, if required;
- (xii) potential impacts on the Crawley AQMA resulting from site operations and HGV traffic should be identified and mitigation set out if required;
- (xiii) opportunities should be sought to enhance future public access.;
- (xiv) access to the site should be through the existing brickworks;
- (xv) as the site contains Grade 3 Agricultural Land Quality, an assessment should be undertaken of the of potential for high quality agricultural land should be undertaken, and mitigated provided, if required;
- (xvi) the power line and BT line should be diverted or protected, as necessary;
- (xvii) the site shall be restored either to agricultural or woodland use in accordance with the following principles, either:
  - a. Reinstate the original profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use. Long term restoration should aim to restore and reinforce existing landscape elements in keeping with the surrounding pattern, including the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees. It should aim to maximise the farmland habitat value and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and woodland. It should also include the creation of ponds, a notable feature of the local landscape and important component of the habitat diversity of the area, or,
  - b. restoring all or part of the site to woodland following extraction. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link it into the surrounding structure of hedgerows and woodland. It should also include the creation of ponds, a notable feature of the local landscape and important component of the habitat diversity of the area.

- (xviii) A site liaison group involving the local community should be established if necessary, by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.

7.2.6. **Ham Farm, Steyning (Policies Map 8):** Located in Steyning, Horsham, the site is used for agricultural purposes, and is approximately 7.9 hectares in size. It would provide 725,000 tonnes of soft sand. Materials would be exported from the site by road. The after use for this site would be a return to agricultural use, and restoration would consider enhancement of the existing woodland within the site.

7.2.7. The development principles for Ham Farm are as follows:

- i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;
- ii. A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites
- iii. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting, and Wiston Park;
- iv. The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;
- v. The access should be carefully sited to ensure lines of mature broadleaf trees remain intact. A tree survey and arboriculture impact assessment in accordance with "BS5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction 2012" should be provided to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from site operations and that any to be removed are clearly identified and appropriate mitigation proposed;
- vi. The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting;
- vii. During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the eastern and southern boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, Cherrytree Rough to the north and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;
- viii. Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, must, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;
- ix. There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;

- x. A historic building setting impact assessment of nearby listed buildings (including but not limited to Horsebrook Cottage and Wappingthorn Manor) should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;
- xi. At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;
- xii. A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to avoid and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, including but not limited to, Alderwood Pond and Wiston Pond;
- xiii. A flood risk assessment should be carried out and mitigation provided, if required;
- xiv. The transport assessment should consider the net impact of changing the land use from agricultural (maize production) to mineral and include allowances for the importation of materials for restoration and importation of feedstock for anaerobic digestion at Wappingthorn Farm;
- xv. A HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the villages of Steyning and Storrington;
- xvi. If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;
- xvii. Vehicular access to the site to be created at the existing gated access and shall be designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;
- xviii. There must be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;
- xix. Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be considered and mitigation provided, if required;
- xx. There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;
- xxi. A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;
- xxii. Options for restoration could include reinstating the original profile of the site and returning it to agricultural use and restoring the structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, with the aim of maximising farmland habitat value, and connectivity with the surrounding structure of hedgerows and lines of trees. Long term restoration should aim to maximise the habitat value by taking opportunities to link the surrounding hedgerow and woodland structure; and
- xxiii. A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.



7.2.8. **East of West Heath Common (Extension), Rogate (Policies Map 9)**: Located near to Rogate, Chichester, the extension to West Heath Quarry is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 14 hectares in size and would provide 950,000 tonnes of soft sand. The area available for extraction may be limited by the development principles set out below, including the results of the hydrogeological survey. Materials would be exported from the extension site to the existing quarry by conveyor or pipeline, for processing, before transport by road using the existing quarry access and routing provision. Development of this site should avoid and minimise any impact on West Heath Common and the River Rother Local Wildlife Site. Development should also contribute to the Petersfield to Pulborough via Midhurst non-motorised route. The after use for this site would be to create a low level water environment that should maximise nature conservation and informal recreation. Any restoration scheme should be fully integrated with the restoration scheme on the existing site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>5</sup>

7.2.9. The development principles for the East of West Heath Common site are as follows:

- i. Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;
- ii. A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;
- iii. A landscape and visual impact assessment should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site (including the use of conveyors or pipeline), taking into account and seeking to minimise adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park;
- iv. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;
- v. Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, must, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;
- vi. There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;
- vii. Proposals should ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the nearby Scheduled Monuments bridges and structures on relevant parts of the road network;

7.1.1. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>5</sup> SSR Landscape Assessment (2019)

- viii. At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;
- ix. A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to avoid and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses. Where necessary, changes to the development boundary will be made to prevent impacts on the water environment;
- x. The potential for impact on the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and East Hampshire Hangers SAC should be considered, and mitigation applied to ensure no harm occurs;
- xi. Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;
- xii. A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;
- xiii. Consideration must be given to ensuring mitigation measures are applied to Public Footpath 861, which is 500m west of the site, and may be impacted by the use of conveyors;
- xiv. Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site.
- xv. A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.

7.2.10. **Chantry Lane Extension, Storrington (Policies Map 10):** Located near to Storrington, Horsham, the extension to Chantry Lane is located within the South Downs National Park, and used for agricultural purposes. The site is approximately 2.5 hectares in size and would provide 1,000,000 tonnes of soft sand. Extraction of material at this location would be linked to an holistic revised restoration scheme and lower levels of extraction at the existing site. The after use for this site could be a return to agricultural use, and restoration would consider enhancement of the existing woodland within the site. The restoration proposals should also take account of the opportunities to improve long distance trails and key public Rights of Way. Restoration proposals should clearly relate to landscape projects in the wider South Downs National Park<sup>6</sup>.

7.2.11. The development principles for the Chantry Lane Extension are as follows:

- (i) Development proposals must identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity;

7.1.1. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>6</sup> SSR Landscape Assessment (2019)

- (ii) A project level Appropriate Assessment is required to assess potential impacts and demonstrate how this site will be delivered without any adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites;
- (iii) A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should inform the development of proposals for the extraction of minerals from the site, taking into account and seeking to minimise impacts on the South Downs National Park;
- (iv) The LVIA should cross reference all other relevant studies within the Environmental Statement in order to ensure that it is fully integrated and considers both direct and indirect impacts from any proposals;
- (v) The entrance to the site should be carefully designed to minimise adverse impacts upon the South Downs National Park and its setting, and designed to accord with the standards and guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Roads in the South Downs;
- (vi) During excavation there should be screening, such as perimeter mounding and planting of native trees and shrubs (including native evergreen species) along the boundaries to strengthen and reinforce existing screening of views into the site from the A283, and surrounding open farmland should be considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process. Any screening landform and/or planting should be designed to be consistent with local landscape character in order to minimise unintended additional impacts on landscape character from incongruous screening features;
- (vii) Existing hedgerows, mature trees and vegetation along perimeters and within the site, must, where possible, be retained and linked to new planting to create continuous corridors of trees and vegetation, connected to wider networks of hedges in surrounding areas;
- (viii) There should be phasing of working and restoration to minimise impacts associated with unrestored open excavated areas;
- (ix) At pre-application stage, a Lidar survey should be undertaken and an assessment of the impacts on buried archaeological remains should be carried out including archaeological field evaluation and mitigation measures where required;
- (x) A hydrological assessment should be completed, evaluating and seeking to avoid and minimise the impact from the proposals on ground water and watercourses, given its location close to the Arun Valley SPA;
- (xi) An HGV routing agreement is required, including a robust approach to monitoring adherence, to ensure that HGVs travelling to/from the site avoid the village of Storrington;
- (xii) If the traffic from the site could have a negative impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Storrington High Street, then an Air Quality Assessment is required;
- (xiii) There must be an assessment of the cumulative impact associated with other development (e.g. other minerals development) including landscape and transport considerations, such as the A24/A283 Washington roundabout and mitigation, if required;
- (xiv) Any loss of potentially high quality agricultural land should be minimised and mitigation provided, if required;
- (xv) There are known power cables, power lines and water mains within and adjacent to the site which should be diverted or protected, as necessary;

- (xvi) A lighting, noise, dust, odour and vibration management plan should be completed, setting out how unacceptable impacts will be avoided;
- (xvii) Proposals for restoration should be informed by a landscape and ecosystem services led strategy agreed with the SDNPA. The strategy should be informed by relevant technical assessments, contribute to the purposes of the SDNP and form a cohesive scheme with the existing quarry site;
- (xviii) A site liaison group involving the local community should be established by the operator to address issues arising from the operation of the site.